TRÜBNER'S

ORIENTAL SERIES.

THE

SÁNKHYA APHORISMS

OF

KAPILA,

WITH

Illustrative Extracts from the Commentaries.

TRANSLATED BY

JAMES R. BALLANTYNE, LL.D.,

LATE PRINCIPAL OF THE BENARES COLLEGE.

THIRD EDITION.

LONDON:
TRÜBNER & CO., LUDGATE HILL.
1885.



ADVERTISEMENT.

THE present work, both in its Sanskrit portion and in its English, is an amended reprint of three volumes,[1] published in India, which have already become very scarce. An abridged form of those volumes,[2] which subsequently

---

[1] Their titles here follow:

"The Aphorisms of the Sánkhya Philosophy of Kapila, with Illustrative Extracts from the Commentaries. [Book I.] Printed for the use of the Benares College, by order of Govt. N. W. P. Allahabad: Printed at the Presbyterian Mission Press. Rev. L. G. HAY, *Sup't.* 1852."

"The Aphorisms of the Sánkhya Philosophy, by Kapila, with Illustrative Extracts from the Commentary. Books II., III., & IV. In Sanskrit and English. Printed for the use of the Benares College, by order of Govt. N. W. P. (1st Edition, 550 *Copies:— Price* 12 *annas.*) Allahabad: Printed at the Presbyterian Mission Press. Rev. L. G. HAY, *Superintendent.* 1854."

"The Aphorisms of the Sánkhya Philosophy, by Kapila, with Illustrative Extracts from the Commentary by Vijnána-Bhikshu. Books V. & VI. Sanskrit and English. Translated by James R. Ballantyne, LL.D., Principal of the Govt. College, Benares. Printed for the use of the Benares College, by order of Govt. N. W. P. (1st Edition, 550 *Copies:—Price* 12 *annas.*) Allahabad: Printed at the Presbyterian Mission Press. Rev. L. G. HAY, *Sup't.* 1856."

[2] Occupying Fasciculi 32 and 81 of the New Series of the *Bibliotheca Indica,* issued in 1862 and 1865. The proof-sheets of only 32 pages of the whole, from the beginning, were read by Dr. Ballantyne; the rest, by Professor Cowell.

The title of the abridged form runs: "The Sánkhya Aphorisms of Kapila, with Extracts from Vijnána Bhiks[h]u's Commentary," &c. But this is a misrepresentation, as regards Book I., which takes up 63 pages out of the total of 175. The expository matter in that Book is derived, very largely, from other commentators than Vijnána.

appeared, contains nothing of the Sanskrit original but the Aphorisms.

While, in the following pages, all the corrections obtainable from the abridgment have been turned to account, an immense number of improved readings have been taken from another source. Three several times I carefully read Dr. Ballantyne's translation in as many different copies of it; entering suggestions, in the second copy, without reference to those which had been entered in the first, and similarly making independent suggestions in my third copy. All these[1] were, on various occasions, submitted to Dr. Ballantyne; and such of them as did not meet his approval were crossed through. The residue, many more than a thousand, have been embodied

Vedánti Mahádeva mainly supplies it at the outset, and, towards the end, well nigh exclusively, Aniruddha. Some share of it, however, will not be traced; it having been furnished by one of Dr. Ballantyne's pandits, whom I have repeatedly seen in the very act, as by his own acknowledgment, of preparing his elucidations.

[1] Many of them, especially in Books II.—VI., rest on readings of the original preferable to those which had been accepted.

Though not fully published till 1856, my edition of the *Sánkhya-pravachana-bháshya*, its preface alone excepted, was in print as early as 1853; and Dr. Ballantyne had a copy of it. A few arbitrarily chosen words apart, his text, after Book I., is borrowed from it throughout, but with no mention of the fact. My advice was unheeded, that he should profit by the copious emendations which I had amassed and digested from better manuscripts than those to which I at first had access. Greatly to his disservice, he would not be induced even to look at them. It faring the same with my typographical corrections, he has, here and there, reproduced errors, more or less gross, which might easily have been avoided. See, for specimens, pp. 197, 288, 357, 373, 374, 381, 390.

in the ensuing sheets, but are not indicated,[1] as successively introduced. The renderings proposed in the footnotes are, for the most part, from among those which have recently occurred to me as eligible.

That Dr. Ballantyne had any thought of reissuing, in whatever form, the volumes mentioned at the beginning of this Advertisement, I was unaware, till some years after he had made over the abridgment of them to Professor Cowell, for publication.[2] Otherwise, I should have placed at his disposal the materials towards improvement of his second edition, which, at the cost of no slight drudgery, are here made available.

The Sánkhya Aphorisms, in all the known commentaries on them, are exhibited word for word. The variants, now given, of the Aphorisms, afforded by accessible productions of that character, have been drawn from the works, of which only one has yet been printed, about to be specified :[3]

I. The *Sánkhya-pravachana-bháshya*, by Vijnána Bhikshu. Revelant particulars I have given elsewhere. My oldest MS. of it was transcribed in 1654.

---

[1] Nor has attention been topically directed to sundry blemishes of idiom which have been removed; as, for example, by the substitution of 'unless' for 'without,' of 'in time' for 'through time,' of 'presently' for 'just,' and of 'between the two' for 'between both.'

[2] "At the time of his departure from India, in 1860, Dr. Ballantyne left with me the MS. of his revised translation of the Sánkhya Aphorisms." "Notice," in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, New Series, No. 81.

[3] For details respecting these commentaries and their authors, see my *Contribution towards an Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems*, or my Preface to the *Sánkhya-sára*.

II. The *Kápila-sánkhya-pravachana-sútra-vṛitti*, by Aniruddha. Of this I have consulted, besides a MS. copied in 1818, formerly the property of Dr. Ballantyne, one which I procured to be copied, in 1855, from an old MS. without date.[1]

III. The *Laghu-sánkhya-sútra-vṛitti*, by Nágeśa. Of this I have two MSS., both undated. One of them is entire; but the other is defective by the three first Books.

IV. The *Sánkhya-pravachana-sútra-vṛitti-sára*, by Vedánti Mahádeva. Here, again, only one of two MSS. which I possess is complete. The other, which breaks off in the midst of the comment on Book II., Aph. 15, is, in places, freely interpolated from No. I. Neither of them has a date.

Nearly all my longer annotations, and some of the shorter, were scrutinized, while in the rough, by the learned Professor Cowell, but for whose searching criticisms, which cannot be valued too highly, they would, in several instances, have been far less accurate than they now are.

F. H.

MARLESFORD, SUFFOLK,
Aug. 28, 1884.

---

[1] I once had a second copy of this very rare work, bearing no date, but most venerable in appearance. Like many of my manuscript treasures, it was lent, and never found its way back to me.

PREFACE.

THE great body of Hindu Philosophy is based upon six sets of very concise Aphorisms. Without a commentary, the Aphorisms are scarcely intelligible; they being designed, not so much to communicate the doctrine of the particular school, as to aid, by the briefest possible suggestions, the memory of him to whom the doctrine shall have been already communicated. To this end they are admirably adapted; and, this being their end, the obscurity which must needs attach to them, in the eyes of the uninstructed, is not chargeable upon them as a fault.

For various reasons it is desirable that there should be an accurate translation of the Aphorisms, with so much of gloss as may be required to render them intelligible. A class of pandits in the Benares Sanskrit College having been induced to learn English, it is contemplated that a version of the Aphorisms, brought out in successive portions, shall be submitted to the criticism of these men, and, through them, of other learned Bráhmans, so that any errors in the version may have the best chance of being discovered and rectified. The employment of such a version as a class-book is designed to subserve, further, the attempt to determine accurately the aspect of the philosophical terminology of the East, as regards that of the West.

These pages, now submitted to the criticism of the pandits who read English, are to be regarded as proof-sheets awaiting correction. They invite discussion.

J. R. B.

BENARES COLLEGE,
5th January, 1852.

THE

SÁNKHYA APHORISMS

OF

KAPILA.

BOOK I.

a. Salutation to the illustrious sage, Kapila![1]

b. Well, the great sage, Kapila, desirous of raising the world [from the Slough of Despond in which he found it sunk], perceiving that the knowledge of the *excellence* of any fruit, through the desire [which this excites] for the fruit, is a cause of people's betaking themselves to the means [adapted to the attainment of the fruit], declares [as follows] the excellence of the fruit [which he would urge our striving to obtain]:[2]

अथ त्रिविधदुःखात्यन्तनिवृत्तिरत्यन्तपुरुषार्थः॥१॥

The subject proposed. *Aph.* 1. Well, the complete cessation of pain [which is] of three kinds is the complete end of man.

---

[1] श्रीकपिलमुनये नमः॥

[2] अथ जगदुद्दिधीर्षुर्महामुनिः कपिलः फलसौन्दर्यज्ञानस्य फलेच्छाद्वारा साधनप्रवृत्तौ कारणत्वं पश्यन्फलसौन्दर्यमाह॥

a. The word 'well' serves as a benediction;[1] [the particle *atha* being regarded as an auspicious one].

b. By saying that the complete cessation of pain, which is of three kinds,—viz., (1) due to one's self (*ádhyátmika*), (2) due to products of the elements (*ádhibhautika*), and (3) due to supernatural causes (*ádhidaivika*),—is the *complete* end of man, he means to say that it is the *chief* end of man, among the four human aims, [viz., merit, wealth, pleasure, and *liberation* (see *Sáhitya-darpaṇa*, § 2)];[2] because the three are transitory, whereas liberation is *not* transitory: such is the state of the case.

A question whether the end may not be attained by ordinary means.

c. But then, let it *be* that the above-mentioned cessation [of all the three kinds of pain] is the complete end of man; still, what reason is there for betaking one's self to a doctrinal system which is the cause of a knowledge of the truth, in the shape of the knowledge of the difference between Nature and Soul, when there are *easy* remedies for bodily pains, viz., drugs, &c., and remedies for mental pains, viz., beautiful women and delicate food, &c., and remedies for pains due to products of the elements, viz., the residing in impregnable localities, &c., as is enjoined in the institutes of polity, and remedies for pains due to supernatural causes, viz., gems [such as possess marvellous prophylactic properties], and spells, and herbs of mighty

---

1 अथ शब्दो मङ्गलार्थः ॥

2 त्रिविधस्याध्यात्मिकाधिभौतिकाधिदैविकरूपस्य दुःखस्यात्यन्तनिवृत्तिरत्यन्तपुरुषार्थश्चतुर्षु पुरुषार्थेषु मध्ये श्रेष्ठः पुरुषार्थ इत्यर्थस्त्रयाणां क्षयित्वान्मोक्षस्याक्षयित्वादिति भावः ॥

power, &c.; and when [on the other hand], since it is hard to get one to grapple with that very difficult knowledge of truth which can be perfected only by the toil of many successive births, it must be still *more* hard to get one to betake himself to the doctrinal system [which treats of the knowledge in question]? Therefore [i.e., seeing that this may be asked] he declares [as follows]:[1]

न दृष्टात्तत्सिद्धिर्निवृत्तेरप्यनुवृत्तिदर्शनात्[2]॥ २ ॥

The end is not to be attained by ordinary means.

Aph. 2. The effectuation of this [complete cessation of pain] is not [to be expected] by means of the visible [such as wealth, &c.]; for we see [on the loss of wealth, &c.,] the restoration [of the misery and evil,] after [its temporary] cessation.

---

[1] नन्वस्तूक्तनिवृत्तिरत्यन्तपुरुषार्थस्तथापि सत्त्वपुरुषान्यताख्यातिरूपतत्त्वज्ञानहेतुशास्त्रप्रवृत्तौ को हेतुः शारीरदुःखनिवर्तकानामौषधादीनां मानसदुःखनिवर्तकानां वरस्त्रीमिष्टान्नादीनमाधिभौतिकदुःखनिवर्तकानां नीतिशास्त्रोपदिष्टनिरत्ययस्थानाध्यासनादीनामाधिदैविकदुःखनिवर्तकानां मणिमन्त्रमहौषधादीनां सुकराणां सत्त्वेनानेकजन्मपरंपरायाससाध्ये तत्त्वज्ञानेऽतिदुष्करे प्रवृत्तेर्दुर्लभत्वेन शास्त्रप्रवृत्तेर्दुर्लभतरत्वादत आह ॥

[2] Instead of निवृत्तेः, the reading of Aniruddha, and of most MSS., Vijnána has, to the same effect, निवृत्ते · *Ed.*

a. 'The visible,' in the shape of the drugs, &c., abovementioned[1] [§ 1. *c.*].

b. 'The effectuation of this,' i.e., the effectuation of the complete cessation of pain.[2]

c. *Why* is it not [to be thus effected]? Because, after the cessation (the cessation of *pain* is understood), we see its restoration, the springing up again of pain in general,[3] [from whichever of its three sources (§ 1. *b.*)].

d. The state of the matter is this: not by the expedients above-mentioned is there such a removal of pain, that no pain arises thereafter; for, when, by this or that expedient, this or that pain has been destroyed, we see other pains springing up. Therefore, though it be *not* easy [§1. *c.*], the knowledge of truth [as a complete remedy] *is* to be desired.[4]

e. But then, grant that *future* pain is not debarred by drugs, &c., [employed to remove *present* pain], still, by

---

[1] दृष्टादुक्तौषधादिरूपात् ॥

[2] तत्सिद्धिर्दुःखात्यन्तनिवृत्तिसिद्धिः ॥

[3] न भवति कुतः। निवृत्तेर्दुःखनिवृत्तेरनन्तरमिति शेषोऽनुवृत्तिदर्शनाद्दुःखजातीयोत्पत्तिदर्शनात्।

[4] अयं भावो नोक्तैरुपायैर्दुःखानुत्पत्तिविशिष्टा दुःखनिवृत्तिर्भवति तत्तदुपायैस्तत्तद्दुःखेषु नष्टेष्वपि दुःखान्तरोत्पत्तिदर्शनात्। तस्मादसुकरत्वेऽपि तत्त्वज्ञानमेषितव्यमिति ॥

again and again obviating it [as often as it presents itself], there may be the cessation of *future* pain, also. This doubt he states [as follows] :[1]

प्रात्यहिकक्षुत्प्रतीकारवत्तत्प्रतीकारचेष्टनात्पुरुषार्थत्वम् ॥ ३ ॥

The question whether the end may not be attained by the recurrent use of ordinary means.

Aph. 3. [Let us consider the doubt] that the soul's desire [the cessation of pain, may result] from exertions for the obviation [of pain], as is the case with the obviation of daily hunger.

a. When pain shall arise [let us suppose one to argue], then it is to be obviated; and thus there is the soul's desire, the cessation of pain; just as one should eat, when there is hunger; and thus there is the soul's desire of the eater, viz., the cessation of hunger. In regard to this [doubt] he states the recognized decision :[2]

सर्वासंभवात्संभवेऽपि सत्त्वासंभवाद्धेयः[3] प्रमाणकुशलैः ॥ ४ ॥

---

[1] ननु मा भूदौषधादिभिर्भाविदुःखनिवृत्तिस्तथापि पुनः पुनः प्रतीकारकरणे तु भाविदुःखनिवृत्तिरपि स्यादिति शङ्कते ।

[2] यदा दुःखमुत्पत्स्यते तदा तत्प्रतिकर्तव्यं तथा च दुःखनिवृत्तिः पुरुषार्थो यथा यदा क्षुत्तदा भोक्तव्यं भुञ्जानस्य क्षुन्निवृत्तिः पुरुषार्थ इति सिद्धान्तयति ॥

[3] The more ordinary reading of MSS., and that of Aniruddha, is सत्ता°, 'excellence,' not सत्त्वा°, with Vijnána. *Ed.*

This suggestion negatived.

Aph. 4. This [method of palliatives (§3)] is to be rejected by those who are versed in evidence; because it is not everywhere possible [to employ it at all], and because, even if this *were* possible, there would be an impossibility as regards [ensuring] the perfect fitness [of the agents employed].

a. For there are not physicians, &c., in every place and at all times; and [to rely on physicians, &c., would not be advisable], even if there were the possibility,—i.e., even if these *were* [always at hand], since physicians are not *perfect* [in their art];—for pain cannot with certainty be got rid of by means of physicians, &c., with their drugs, &c. Moreover, when corporeal pain has departed, there may still be that which is *mental*, &c.; so that there is not [under such circumstances], in every respect, liberation from pain. For these reasons, *such* a soul's aim [as that which contents itself with temporary palliatives] is to be rejected by those who are versed in evidence,[1] [i.e., who are acquainted with authoritative treatises].

b. He mentions another proof[2] [of his assertion]:

---

[1] नहि सर्वस्मिन्देशे सर्वस्मिन्काले वैद्यादयः सन्ति संभवेऽपि सत्त्वेऽपि वैद्यादीनां सत्त्वाभावान्नहि वैद्यादिभिरप्यवश्यमौषधादिना दुःखं हातुं शक्यते। किं च शारीरदुःखापगमे मानसादेस्तस्य संभव इति न सर्वथा दुःखाद्विमोकः। तस्मात्प्रमाणकुशलैरीदृग्विधपुरुषार्थो हेय इति ॥

[2] युक्त्यन्तरमाह ॥

उत्कर्षादपि मोक्षस्य सर्वोत्कर्षश्रुतेः ॥ ५ ॥

Scriptural evidence in favour of this view.

Aph. 5. Also [an inferior method ought not to be adopted,] because of the preeminence of Liberation [as proved] by the text [of Scripture declaratory] of its pre-eminence above all else.

a. One ought not to endeavour after the removal of this or that pain by these and those expedients [§ 1. *c.*]; since Liberation (*moksha*), by being eternal, is transcendent as a remover of all pains. Moreover, one ought to endeavour only after the knowledge of truth, which is the means thereof [i.e., of Liberation]; because the Scripture tells its pre-eminence above all [other objects of endeavour], in the text: 'There is nothing beyond the gaining of Soul,[1] [with the utter exclusion of pain].'

b. But then [it may be suggested], when you say *liberation*, we understand you to mean from *bondage*. And is that bondage essential? Or is it adventitious? In the former case, it is incapable of destruction; if it come under the latter head, it will perish of itself, [like any other adventitious and, therefore, transitory thing]. What have we to do with your 'knowledge of truth,' then? To this he replies [as follows]:[2]

---

[1] न तैस्तैरुपायैस्तत्तद्दुःखोच्छेदे यतितव्यं मोक्षस्य नित्यत्वेन सर्वदुःखोच्छेदरूपत्वेनोत्कर्षात्। आत्मलाभात्परं न विद्यत इति सर्वोत्कर्षश्रुतेरपि तत्साधने तत्त्वज्ञान एव यतितव्यम्॥

[2] ननु मोक्ष इत्युक्ते बन्धादिति प्रतीयते। स च

अविशेषश्चोभयोः ॥ ६ ॥

An objection met.

Aph. 6. And there is no difference between the two.

a. There is no difference in the applicability of liberation, on either of the suppositions, that the bondage is essential, and that it is adventitious, [supposing it were either (see § 19. *b.*)]. That is to say, we can tell both how the bondage takes place, and how the liberation takes place.[1]

b. Now, with the view of demonstrating [the real nature of] Bondage and Liberation, he declares, exclusively, in the first place, the objections to Bondage's being *essential*[2] [§ 5. *b.*]:

न स्वभावतो बद्धस्य मोक्षसाधनोपदेशविधिः ॥ ७ ॥

Liberation must be possible; else the means would not have been enjoined.

Aph. 7. There would be no rule in the enjoining of means for the liberation of one bound *essentially*.

बन्धः किं स्वाभाविक उतागन्तुकः। आद्ये नाशायोगोऽन्ये चेत्स्वत एव नङ्क्ष्यति। किं तत्त्वज्ञानेनेत्यत आह ॥

[1] उभयोर्बन्धस्य स्वाभाविकागन्तुकत्वयोर्मोक्षस्योपादेयत्वेऽविशेषः। यथा बन्धस्योपपत्तिर्यथा च मोक्षस्य तथा वयं वक्तुं शक्नुम इत्यर्थः ॥

[2] अथ बन्धमोक्षयोरुपपत्त्यर्थमादौ तावत्स्वाभाविकत्वे बन्धस्य दूषणान्याह ॥

a. Since Liberation has been stated [§ 1] to result from the complete cessation of pain, [it follows that] Bondage is the junction of pain; and this is not *essential* in man. For, if that were the case, then there would be no rule, i.e., no fitness, in the Scriptural or legal injunction of means for liberation: such is what must be supplied, [to complete the aphorism]. Because, to explain our meaning [by an illustration], *fire* cannot be liberated from its *heat*, which is essential to it; since that which is *essential* exists as long as the substance exists.[1]

b. And it has been declared in the Divine Song [the *Íśwara-gítá*,]: 'If the soul were essentially foul, or impure, or changeable, then its liberation could not take place even through hundreds of successive births.'[2]

c. [Since some one may be disposed to say] '*Grant* that there is no fitness [in the Scriptural and legal injunctions, (§ 7. *a.*)], what have we to do with *that*?' Therefore he declares [as follows]:[3]

---

[1] दुःखात्यन्तनिवृत्तेर्मोक्षत्वाद्बन्धो दुःखयोगः स च पुरुषे न स्वाभाविकः। तथा सति मोक्षाय साधनोपदेशस्य श्रौतस्य स्मार्तस्य च विधिरनुष्ठानं न घटत इति शेषः। न ह्यग्नेः स्वाभाविकादौष्ण्यान्मोक्षः संभवति स्वाभाविकस्य यावद्द्रव्यभावित्वादिति भावः।

[2] उक्तं चेश्वरगीतायाम्। यद्यात्मा मलिनोऽस्वच्छो विकारी स्यात्स्वभावतः। नहि तस्य भवेन्मुक्तिर्जन्मान्तरशतैरपीति॥

[3] भवत्वननुष्ठानं किमेतावतेत्यत आह॥

स्वभावस्यानपायित्वादननुष्ठानलक्षणमप्रा-
माण्यम् ॥ ८ ॥

Scripture would be nugatory, if pain were inevitable.

Aph. 8. Since an essential nature is imperishable, unauthoritativeness, betokened by impracticableness, [would be chargeable against the Scripture, if pain were essential to humanity].

a. That is to say: since the essential nature of anything is imperishable, i. e., endures as long as the thing itself, it would follow [on the supposition that pain is essential to humanity], that, since Liberation is *impossible*, the Scripture which enjoins the means for its attainment is a false authority, inasmuch as it is impracticable[1] [in its injunctions. And this is out of the question; Scripture being assumed, here, as in all the others of the six systems, to be an exact measure of truth].

b. But then [some one may say], let it *be* an injunction [to use means for the attainment of an unattainable object], on the mere strength of Scripture;[2] [and, since Scripture is an unquestionable authority, we may be excused from asking or answering the question, *why* the injunction is given]. To this he replies [as follows]:

नाशक्योपदेशविधिरुपदिष्टेऽप्यनुपदेशः ॥ ९ ॥

---

[1] स्वभावस्यानपायित्वाद्यावद्द्रव्यभावित्वान्मोक्षासंभवेन तत्साधनोपदेशश्रुतेरननुष्ठानलक्षणमप्रामाण्यं स्यादित्यर्थः ॥

[2] ननु श्रुतिबलादेवानुष्ठानं स्यात्तत्राह ॥

An impracticable injunction is no rule.

Aph. 9. There is no rule, where something impossible is enjoined: though it *be* enjoined, it is no injunction.

a. There can be no fitness, or propriety, in an injunction with a view to an impossible fruit; seeing that, though something be enjoined, or ordered [to be effected] by means that are impracticable, this is no injunction at all, but only the *semblance* of an injunction; because it stands to reason, that not even the *Veda* can make one see sense in an absurdity: such is the meaning.[1]

b. Here he comes upon a doubt:[2]

शुक्लपटवद्बीजवच्चेत् ॥ १० ॥

A doubt whether the essential be not removable.

Aph. 10. If [some one says] as in the case of white cloth, or of a seed, [something essential may be not irremovable, then he will find his answer in the next aphorism].

a. But then [the doubter is supposed to argue], the destruction even of what is essential [in spite of what is stated under § 7] *is* seen; as, for example, the essential whiteness of white cloth is removed by dyeing, and the essential power of germination in a seed is removed by

---

[1] अशक्याय फलायोपदेशस्य विधिरनुष्ठानं न संभवति यत उपदिष्टे विहितेऽप्यशक्योपायेनोपदेश एव न भवति किं तूपदेशाभास एव बाधितमर्थं वेदोऽपि न बोधयतीति न्यायादित्यर्थः ॥

[2] अत्र शङ्कते ।

fire. Therefore, according to the analogy of the white cloth and the seed, it is possible that there should be the removal of the bondage of the soul, even though it *were* essential. So, too, there may be [without any impropriety] the enjoinment of the means thereof. Well, *if* [any one argues thus], such is the meaning[1] [of the aphorism, to which he proceeds to reply].

b. He declares[2] [the real state of the case, with reference to the doubt just raised]:

शक्त्युद्भवानुद्भवाभ्यां नाशक्योपदेशः ॥ ११ ॥

Decision that an essential property may be hidden, but not removed.

Aph. 11. Since both perceptibleness and [subsequent] non-perceptibleness may belong to some power [which is indestructible], it is not something *impracticable* that is enjoined, [when one is directed to render some indestructible power imperceptible].

a. In regard even to the two examples above-mentioned [§ 10], people do not give an injunction for [the positive destruction of] something essential, which is indestructible [§ 8]. Why [do we say this]? Because, in these two

---

[1] ननु स्वाभाविकस्याप्यपायो दृश्यते यथा शुक्लपटस्य स्वाभाविकं शौक्ल्यं रागेणापनीयते यथा च बीजस्य स्वाभाविक्यङ्कुरशक्तिरग्निनापनीयते । अतः शुक्लपटवद्बीजवच्च स्वाभाविकस्यापि बन्धस्यापायः पुरुषे संभवतीति । तद्वदेव तत्साधनोपदेशः स्यादिति चेदित्यर्थः ॥

[2] समाधत्ते ॥

instances of the perceptibleness and non-perceptibleness of a power [the powers, namely, of appearing white and of germinating (see § 10. *a.*)], there are merely the manifestation and [afterwards] the *hiding* of the whiteness, &c., but not the *removal* of the whiteness, or of the power of germination ; because, that is to say, the whiteness of the dyed cloth and the germinating power of the roasted seed can again be brought out by the processes of the bleacher, &c., [in the case of the dyed cloth], and by the will of the *Yogí*, [the possessor of supernatural powers, in the case of the roasted seed], &c.[1]

b. Having thus disproved the notion that bondage is *essential* [to man], wishing to disprove also the notion that it is the result of some [adherent] *cause*, he rejects the [various supposable] causes, viz., Time, &c.:[2]

---

[1] उक्तदृष्टान्तयोरप्यशक्याय स्वाभाविकायोपदेशो लोकानां न भवति। कुतः। शक्त्युद्भवानुद्भवाभ्यां दृष्टान्तद्वये शुक्लत्वादेराविर्भावतिरोभावावेव भवतो न तु शौक्ल्यस्याङ्कुरशक्तेश्चापायः। रजकादिव्यापारैर्योगिसंकल्पादिभिश्च रक्तपटभृष्टबीजयोः पुनः शौक्ल्यस्याङ्कुरशक्तेश्चाविर्भावादिति भावः॥

[2] एवं बन्धस्य स्वाभाविकत्वं निराकृत्य नैमित्तिकत्वमपि निराकरिष्यन्निमित्तानि कालादीनि निराकरोति॥

न कालयेागतेा व्यापिनेा नित्यस्य सर्वसंबन्धात् ॥ १२ ॥

Time, which applies to all, cannot be the cause of the bondage of a part.

Aph. 12. Not from connexion with *time* [does bondage befall the soul]; because this, all-pervading and eternal, is [eternally] associated with *all*, [and not with those alone who are in bondage].

a. The bondage of man is not caused by *time;* because [if that were the case,] there could be no such separation as that of the *liberated* and *unliberated;* because time, which applies to everything, and is eternal, is at all times associated with all men,[1] [and must, therefore, bring *all* into bondage, if any].

न देशयोगतोऽप्यस्मात् ॥ १३ ॥

Place, for the same reason, cannot be the cause.

Aph. 13. Nor [does bondage arise] from connexion with *place*, either, for the same [reason].

a. That is to say: bondage does not arise from connexion with *place*. Why? 'For the same reason,' i.e., for that stated in the preceding aphorism, viz., that, since it [viz., place] is connected with *all* men, whether liberated

---

[1] न कालनिमित्तकः पुरुषस्य बन्धो व्यापिनेा नित्यस्य कालस्य सर्वैः पुरुषैः सर्वकालावच्छेदेन संबन्धान्मुक्तामुक्तव्यवस्थानुपपत्तेः ॥

or not liberated, bondage would [in *that* case] befall the *liberated*, also.[1]

नावस्थातो देहधर्मत्वात्तस्याः ॥ १४ ॥

The soul is not kept in bondage by its being conditioned.

Aph. 14. Nor [does the bondage of the soul arise] from its being conditioned [by its standing among circumstances that clog it by limiting it]; because *that* is the fact in regard to [not the soul, but] the *body*.

a. By 'condition' we mean the being in the shape of a sort of association. The bondage [of the soul] does not arise from *that*; because *that* is the property of the *body* [and not of the soul]; because, that is to say, bondage might befall even the liberated [which is impossible], if that which is the fact in regard to another could occasion the bondage of one quite different.[2]

b. But then [some one might say], *let* this conditioned state belong to the soul. On this point [to prevent mistakes], he declares:[3]

---

[1] देशयोगतोऽपि न बन्धः। कुतः। अस्मात्पूर्वसूत्रोक्तान्मुक्तामुक्तसर्वपुरुषसंबन्धान्मुक्तस्यापि बन्धापत्तेरित्यर्थः॥

[2] अवस्था संघातविशेषरूपता। ततो न बन्धस्तस्या देहधर्मत्वादन्यधर्मस्य साक्षादन्यबन्धकत्वे मुक्तस्यापि बन्धापत्तेरिति भावः॥

[3] ननु पुरुषस्यैवावस्था स्यात्तत्राह॥

असङ्गोऽयं पुरुष इति ॥ १५ ॥

The soul is absolute.

Aph. 15. Because this soul is [unassociated with any conditions or circumstances that could serve as its bonds, it is] absolute.

a. The word *iti* here shows that it [i.e., the assertion conveyed in the aphorism] is a *reason;* the construction with the preceding aphorism being this, that, *since* the soul is unassociated, it belongs only to the body to be conditioned.[1]

न कर्मणान्यधर्मत्वादतिप्रसक्तेश्च[2]॥ १६ ॥

The fruit of works belongs not to the soul.

Aph. 16. Nor [does the bondage of soul arise] from any work; because [works are] the property of another [viz., the mind], and because it [the bondage] would be eternal,[3] [if the case were as you imagine].

---

[1] इतिर्हेतौ पुरुषस्यासङ्गत्वादवस्थाया देहमात्रधर्मत्वमिति पूर्वसूत्रेणान्वयः ॥

[2] The commentator Aniruddha omits the final word, च. *Ed.*

[3] Professor Wilson's Dictionary erroneously gives 'uninterrupted continuance' as one of the definitions of *atiprasanga*; and that definition, in all probability, suggested 'eternal' to the translator, who here had to do with *atiprasakti*. Near the end of *a*, in the next page but one, *atiprasanga* is rendered 'undue result.' For the synonymous *atiprasakti* and *atiprasanga*, respectively, see Aph. 53, with the comment on it, and the comment on Aph. 151, of this Book.

Colebrooke, on various occasions, represents one or other of these terms by 'wrest,' 'straining a rule,' 'room for misconstruction,' &c. As technicalities, they generally signify 'illegitimately extended application' of a canon, notion, or the like. *Ed.*

a. That is to say: moreover, the bondage of the soul does not arise from any work, whether enjoined or forbidden; because works are the property of another, i.e., not the property of the soul [but of the mind]. And, if, through a property of another, the bondage of one quite distinct could take place, then bondage might befall even the liberated[1], [through some acts of some one else].

b. But then [some one may say], this objection does not apply, if we hold that bondage may arise from the acts of the *associate*[2] [viz., the mental organ]: so, with allusion to this, he states another reason, 'and because it would be eternal,' i.e., because bondage, in the shape of connexion with pain, would occur [where it does not,] even in such cases as the universal dissolution[3] [of the phenomenal universe, including the mental organ, but *not* the soul].

A doubt whether the bondage, also, belongs not to something else than the soul.

c. But then [some one may say], if that be the case, then let the bondage, too, in the shape of connexion with pain, belong [not to the *soul*, but] to the *mind* alone, in accordance with the principle that it have the same locus as the works [to which it is due]; and, since it is an established point that pain is an affection

---

[1] न विहितनिषिद्धकर्मणापि पुरुषस्य बन्धः कर्मणोऽन्यधर्मत्वादनात्मधर्मत्वादित्यर्थः। अन्यधर्मेण साक्षादन्यस्य बन्धे च मुक्तस्यापि बन्धापत्तेः॥

[2] *Upádhi*, for which see p. 53, 1, *infra.* *Ed.*

[3] ननु स्वोपाधिकर्मणा बन्धाङ्गीकारे नायं दोष इत्याशयेन हेत्वन्तरमाहातिप्रसक्तेश्चेति प्रलयादावपि दुःखयोगरूपबन्धापत्तेश्चेत्यर्थः॥

of the *mind*, why is bondage [i.e., connexion with pain] assumed of the *soul*, also? With reference to this doubt, he declares [as follows]:[1]

विचित्रभोगानुपपत्तिरन्यधर्मत्वे ॥ १७ ॥

Why it is to the soul that the bondage must belong

Aph. 17. If it were the property of any other, then there could not be diverse experience.

a. If bondage, in the shape of connexion with pain, were the property of another, i.e., a property of the *mind*, there could be no such thing as diverse experience; there could be no such different experience as one man's experiencing pain, and another man's not: [for, it must be remembered, it is not in point of *mind*, but of *soul*, that men are held, by Kapila, to be numerically different]. Therefore, it must be admitted that pain is connected with the soul, also. And this [pain that belongs to the soul] is in the shape merely of a *reflexion* of the pain [that attaches to its attendant organism]; and this reflexion is of its *own* attendant [organism] only; so that there is no undue result[2] [deducible from our theory].

---

[1] नन्वेवं दुःखयोगरूपोऽपि बन्धः कर्मसामानाधिकरण्यानुरोधेन चित्तस्यैवस्तु दुःखस्य चित्तधर्मतायाः सिद्धत्वाच्च किमर्थं पुरुषस्यापि कल्प्यते बन्ध इत्याशङ्कायामाह ॥

[2] दुःखयोगरूपबन्धस्यान्यधर्मत्वे चित्तधर्मत्वे विचित्रभोगानुपपत्तिः कश्चिदेव दुःखभोक्ता कश्चिन्नेति विचित्रभोगानुपपत्तिः । अतः पुरुषेऽपि

b. He rejects also the notion that Nature (*prakṛiti*) is *directly* the cause of bondage:[1]

प्रकृतिनिबन्धनाच्चेन्न तस्या अपि[2] पारतन्त्र्यम् ॥१८॥

Nature is not the immediate cause of the soul's bondage.

Aph. 18. If [you say that the soul's bondage arises] from Nature, as its cause, [then I say] 'no;' [because] that, also, is a dependent thing.

a. But then [some one may say], let bondage result from *Nature,* as its cause. If you say so, I say 'no;' because that, also, i.e., Nature, also, is dependent on the *conjunction* which is to be mentioned in the next aphorism; because, if it [Nature] were to occasion bondage, even *without* that [conjunction which is next to be mentioned], then bondage would occur even in such cases as the universal dissolution,[3] [when soul is altogether disconnected from the phenomenal].

दुःखयोगः स्वीकार्यः । स च दुःखप्रतिबिम्बरूप एव प्रतिबिम्बश्च स्वोपाधेरेव भवतीति नातिप्रसङ्ग इति ॥

[1] साक्षात्प्रकृतिनिमित्तकत्वमपि बन्धस्यापाकरोति ॥

[2] Here and in the comment, I have corrected तस्यापि. *Ed.*

[3] ननु प्रकृतिनिमित्ताद्बन्धो भवत्विति चेन्न यतस्तस्या अपि प्रकृतेरप्युत्तरसूत्रे वक्ष्यमाणसंयोगपारतन्त्र्यं तेन विनापि बन्धकत्वे प्रलयादावपि बन्धप्रसङ्गात् ॥

b. If the reading [in the aphorism] be *nibandhaná*[1] [in the 1st case, and not in the 5th], then the construction will be as follows: 'If [you say that] the bondage is caused by Nature,' &c.[2]

c. Therefore, since Nature can be the cause of bondage, only as depending on something else [i.e., on the conjunction to be mentioned in the next aphorism], through this very sort of conjunction [it follows that] the bondage is *reflexional,* like the heat of water due to the conjunction of fire;[3] [water being held to be essentially cold, and to *seem* hot only while the heat continues in conjunction with it].

d. He establishes his own tenet, while engaged on this point, in the very middle[4] [of his criticisms on erroneous notions in regard to the matter; for there are more to come]:

न नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावस्य तद्योगस्तद्योगादृते[5] ॥ १९ ॥

---

[1] This is the lection preferred by Aniruddha and his followers. *Ed.*

[2] निबन्धना चेदिति पाठे प्रकृतिनिबन्धना बद्धता चेदिति योज्यम् ॥

[3] अतो यत्परतन्त्रा प्रकृतिर्बन्धकारणं भवेत्तस्मादेव संयोगविशेषादौपाधिको बन्धोऽग्निसंयोगाज्जलौष्ण्यवदिति ॥

[4] स्वसिद्धान्तममुनैव प्रसङ्गेनान्तराल एवावधारयति ॥

[5] Here follows, in the first edition, the particle तु, for which no authority has been discovered. The word translating it I have retained, but bracketed. *Ed.*

What really is the relation of its bondage to the soul.

Aph. 19. [But] not without the conjunction thereof [i.e., of Nature] is there the connexion of that [i.e., of pain] with that [viz., the soul,] which is ever essentially a pure and free intelligence.

a. Therefore,[1] without the conjunction thereof, i.e., without the conjunction of Nature, there is not, to the soul, any connexion with that, i.e., any connexion with bondage; but, moreover, just through that [connexion with Nature] does bondage take place.[2]

b. In order to suggest the fact that the bondage [of the soul] is reflexional [and not inherent in it, either essentially or adventitiously], he makes use of the indirect expression with a double negative, ['not without']. For, if bondage were produced by the conjunction [of the soul] with Nature, as colour is produced by heating [in the case of a jar of black clay, which becomes red in the baking], then, just like that, it would continue even after disjunction therefrom; [as the red colour remains in the jar, after the fire of the brick-kiln has been extinguished, whereas the red colour occasioned in a crystal vase by a China-rose, while it occurs *not without* the China-rose, ceases, on the removal thereof]. Hence, as bondage ceases, on the disjunction [of the soul] from Nature, the bondage is merely reflexional, and neither essential [§ 5. *b.*] nor adventitious[3] [§ 11. *b.*].

---

[1] The Sanskrit word thus rendered was inadvertently omitted in the first edition. Vijnána here supplies the comment. *Ed.*

[2] तस्मात्तद्योगादृते प्रकृतिसंयोगं विना न पुरुषस्य तद्योगो बन्धसंपर्कोऽस्ति । अपि तु तत एव बन्धः ॥

[3] बन्धस्यौपाधिकत्वलाभाय नञ्द्वयेन वक्रोक्तिः ।

c. In order that there may not be such an error as that of the Vaiśeshikas, viz., [the opinion that there is] an absolutely real conjunction [of the soul] with pain, he says 'which is ever,' &c. [§ 19]. That is to say: as the connexion of *colour* with essentially pure crystal does not take place without the conjunction of the China-rose [the hue of which, seen athwart the crystal, seems to belong to the crystal], just so the connexion of *pain* with the soul, ever essentially pure, &c., could not take place without the conjunction of some accidental associate; that is to say, pain, &c., cannot arise *spontaneously*,[1] [any more than a red colour can arise spontaneously in the crystal which is essentially pure].

d. This has been declared, in the *Saura*, as follows: 'As the pure crystal is regarded, by people, as red, in consequence of the proximity of something [as a China-rose]

यदि हि बन्धः पाकजरूपवत्प्रकृतिसंयोगजन्यः स्यात्तदा तद्वदेव तद्वियोगेऽप्यनुवर्तेत। अतः प्रकृतिवियोगे बन्धाभावादौपाधिक एव बन्धो न तु स्वाभाविको नैमित्तिको वेति ॥

[1] वैशेषिकाणामिव पारमार्थिको दुःखयोग इति भ्रमो मा भूदित्येतदर्थं नित्येत्यादि। यथा स्वभावशुद्धस्फटिकस्य रागो न जपायोगं विना घटते तथैव नित्यशुद्धादिस्वभावस्य पुरुषस्योपाधिसंयोगं विना दुःखसंयोगो न घटते स्वतो दुःखाद्यसंभवादित्यर्थः ॥

that lends its colour, in like manner the supreme soul[1] [is regarded as being affected by pain].'

e. In that [aphorism, 19], the perpetual purity means the being ever devoid of merit and demerit; the perpetual intelligence means the consisting of uninterrupted thought; and the perpetual liberatedness means the being ever dissociated from *real* pain: that is to say, the connexion with pain in the shape of a *reflexion* is not a real bondage,[2] [any more than the reflexion of the China-rose is a real stain in the crystal].

f. And so the maker of the aphorism means, that the cause of its bondage is just a particular *conjunction* [§ 19.*c.*]. And now enough as to that point.[3]

g. Now he rejects [§ 18.*d.*] certain causes of [the soul's] bondage, preferred by others:[4]

---

[1] तदुक्तं सौरे। यथा हि केवलो रक्तः स्फटिको लक्ष्यते जनैः। रञ्जकाद्युपधानेन तद्वत्परमपूरुष इति ॥

[2] तत्र नित्यशुद्धत्वं सदापुण्यपापशून्यत्वं नित्यबुद्धत्वमलुप्तचिद्रूपत्वं नित्यमुक्तत्वं सदापारमार्थिकदुःखायुक्तत्वं प्रतिबिम्बरूपदुःखयोगस्त्वपारमार्थिको बन्ध इति भावः ॥

[3] तथा च संयोगविशेष एवात्र बन्धहेतुतया सूत्रकृदभिप्रेत इत्यलम् ॥

[4] इदानीमन्याभिप्रेतान्बन्धहेतून्निरस्यति ॥

नाविद्यातोऽप्यवस्तुना बन्धायोगात् ॥ २० ॥

The Vedántic tenet on this point disputed.

Aph. 20. Not from Ignorance, too, [does the soul's bondage arise]; because that which is not a reality is not adapted to binding.

a. The word 'too' is used with reference to the previously mentioned 'Time,' &c.,[1] [§ 12, which had been rejected, as causes of the bondage, antecedently to the statement, in §19, of the received cause].

b. Neither, too, does [the soul's] union with bondage result directly from 'Ignorance,' as is the opinion of those who assert non-duality [or the existence of no reality save one (see *Vedánta-sára,* § 20. *b.*)]; because, since their 'Ignorance' is not a real thing, it is not fit to bind; because, that is to say, the binding of any one with a rope merely *dreamt* of was never witnessed.[2]

c. But, if 'Ignorance' *be* a reality [as some assert], then he declares [as follows]:[3]

वस्तुत्वे सिद्धान्तहानिः ॥ २१ ॥

The Vedánti cannot evade the objection, without stultifying himself.

Aph. 21. If it ['Ignorance'] *be* [asserted, by you, to be] a reality, then there is an abandonment of the [Vedántic] tenet, [by you who profess to follow the Vedánta].

---

[1] अपिशब्दः पूर्वोक्तकालाद्यपेक्षया ॥

[2] अविद्यातोऽपि न साक्षाद्बन्धयोगोऽद्वैतवादिनां तेषामविद्याया अप्यवस्तुत्वेन तया बन्धानौचित्यान्नहि स्वाप्नरज्ज्वा बन्धनं दृष्टमित्यर्थः ॥

[3] अविद्याया वस्तुत्वे त्वाह ॥

a. That is to say: and, if you agree that 'Ignorance' *is* a reality, then you abandon your own implied dogma [see Nyáya Aphorisms I., § 31] of the unreality of 'Ignorance;'[1] [and so you stultify yourself].

b. He states another objection:[2]

विजातीयद्वैतापत्तिश्च ॥ २२ ॥

The Vedántí cannot evade the objection, without conceding a duality.

Aph. 22. And [if you assume 'Ignorance' to be a reality, then] there would be a *duality*, through [there being] something of a different kind [from soul; which you asserters of *non-duality* cannot contemplate allowing].

a. That is to say: if 'Ignorance' is real and without a beginning, then it is eternal, and coordinate with Soul: if [therefore] it be *not* soul, then there is a duality, through [there being] something of a different kind [from soul; and this the Vedántís cannot intend to establish]; because these followers of the *Vedánta*, asserting *non-duality*, hold that there is neither a duality through there being something of the same kind [with soul], nor through there being something of a different kind.[3]

---

[1] यदि चाविद्याया वस्तुत्वं स्वीक्रियते तदा स्वाभ्युपगतस्याविद्यानृतत्वस्य हानिरित्यर्थः ॥

[2] दूषणान्तरमाह ॥

[3] यद्यविद्या वस्तुभूतानादिस्तदा नित्यात्मतुल्या। अनात्मत्वे विजातीयद्वैतत्वम्। ते हि वेदान्तिनोऽद्वैतवादिनः सजातीयविजातीयद्वैताभावं मन्यन्त इति ॥

b. He ponders a doubt :[1]

विरुद्धोभयरूपा चेत् ॥ २३ ॥

The Vedántí must not allege that 'Ignorance' is at once real and unreal.

Aph. 23. If [the Vedántí alleges, regarding 'Ignorance,' that] it is in the shape of both these opposites, [then we shall say 'no,' for the reason to be assigned in the next aphorism].

a. The meaning is: if [the Vedántí says that] 'Ignorance' is not *real*,—else there would be a duality through [there being] something of a different kind [from soul, which a follower of the Vedánta cannot allow],—and, moreover, it is not *unreal*, because we experience its effects; but it is in the shape of something at once real and unreal,[2] [like Plato's ὂν καὶ μὴ ὄν: (see *Vedánta-sára*, § 21)].

न तादृक्पदार्थाप्रतीतेः ॥ २४ ॥

There is no such thing as a thing at once real and unreal.

Aph. 24. [To the suggestion that 'Ignorance' is at once real and unreal, we say] 'no;' because no such thing is known [as is at once real and unreal.]

a. That is to say: it is not right to say that 'Ignorance' is at once real and unreal. The reason of this he states in the words 'because no such thing,' &c.; because any such thing as is at once real and unreal is not known.

---

[1] शङ्कते ॥

[2] अविद्या न सती येन विजातीयद्वैतापत्तिर्नाप्यसती कार्योपलम्भात्किं तु सदसद्रूपा चेदित्यर्थः ॥

For, in the case of a dispute, it is necessary that there should be an *example* of the thing [i.e. (see Nyáya Aphorisms, I., § 25), a case in which all parties are agreed that the property in dispute is really present]; and, as regards *your* opinion, such is not to be found; [for, where is there anything in regard to which both parties are agreed that it is at once real and unreal, as they are agreed that fire is to be met with on the culinary hearth?]: such is the import.[1]

b. Again he ponders a doubt:[2]

न वयं षट्पदार्थवादिनो वैशेषिकादिवत् ॥ २५ ॥

A question whether the Vedántí is bound to avoid self-contradiction

Aph. 25. [Possibly the Vedántí may remonstrate] '*We* are not asserters of any Six Categories, like the *Vaiśeshikas* and others.'

a. "'We are not asserters of a definite set of categories [like the *Vaiśeshikas*, who arrange all things under six heads, and the *Naiyáyikas*, who arrange them under sixteen]. Therefore, we hold that there *is* such a thing, unknown though it be [to people in general], as 'Ignorance' which is at once real and unreal, or [if you prefer it], which differs at once from the real and the unreal [see

---

[1] सदसद्रूपाविद्येति न युक्तमित्यर्थः। तत्र हेतुमाह तादृगिति सदसद्रूपस्य कस्यचिदपि पदार्थस्याप्रतीतेः। विवादास्पदे हि वस्तुनि दृष्टान्त आवश्यकः स च भवन्मयेऽप्रसिद्ध इति भावः॥

[2] पुनः शङ्कते॥

Vedánta-sára, § 21]; because this is established by proofs,'[1] [Scriptural or otherwise, which are satisfactory to *us*, although they may not comply with all the technical requisitions of Gotama's scheme of argumentative exposition (see Nyáya Aphorisms, I., § 35)].

b. By the expression [in the aphorism] 'and others' are meant the *Naiyáyikas;* for the *Naiyáyika* is an asserter of sixteen categories[2] [see Nyáya Aphorisms, I., § 1].

c. He confutes[3] [this pretence of evading the objection, by disallowing the categories of the Nyáya]:

अनियतत्वेऽपि नायौक्तिकस्य संग्रहोऽन्यथा बालोन्मत्तादिसमत्वम् ॥ २६ ॥

The self-contradictory is altogether inadmissible.

Aph. 26. Even although this be not compulsory [that the categories be six, or sixteen], there is no acceptance of the inconsistent; else we come to the level of children, and madmen, and the like.

a. Let there be [accepted] no system of categories [such as that of the Vaiśeshika, § 25]; still, since *being* and *not-being* are contradictory, it is impossible for disciples to

---

[1] न वयं नियतपदार्थवादिनः । अतोऽप्रतीतोऽपि सदसदात्मकः सदसद्विलक्षणो वाविद्यापदार्थ इत्यङ्गीकुर्मो मानसिद्धत्वात् ॥

[2] आदिपदान्नैयायिकः स हि षोडसपदार्थवादीति ॥

[3] परिहरति ॥

admit, merely on Your Worship's assertion, a thing at once real and unreal, which is inconsistent, contrary to all fitness: otherwise, we might as well accept also the self-contradictory assertions of children and the like: such is the meaning.[1]

b. Certain heretics [deniers of the authority of the Vedas] assert that there exist external objects of momentary duration [individually; each being, however, replaced by its facsimile the next instant, so that the uninterrupted series of productions becomes something equivalent to continuous duration], and that by the influence[2] of these the bondage of the soul [is occasioned]. This he objects to, [as follows]:[3]

---

[1] पदार्थनियमो मास्तु तथापि भावाभावविरोधेनायौक्तिकस्य युक्तिविरुद्धस्य सदसदात्मकपदार्थस्य संग्रहो भवद्वचनमात्राच्छिष्याणां न संभवति। अन्यथा बालकाद्युक्तस्याप्ययौक्तिकस्य संग्रहः स्यादित्यर्थः ॥

[2] *Vásaná*, a term which Dr. Ballantyne has rendered variously, in divers passages of the present work, and also elsewhere. It is well defined, in Prof. Benfey's *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*: 'An impression remaining unconsciously in the mind, from past actions, etc., and, by the resulting merit or demerit, producing pleasure or pain.' *Ed.*

[3] केचिन्नास्तिका आहुः सन्ति बाह्यविषयाः क्षणिकास्तेषां वासनया जीवस्य बन्ध इति तद्दूषयति ॥

नानादिविषयोपरागनिमित्तकोऽप्यस्य[1] ॥ २७ ॥

The heretical theory of a succession of momentary objects from all eternity, as causing the soul's bondage, rejected.

Aph. 27. [The bondage] thereof, moreover, is not caused by any influence of objects from all eternity.

a. 'Thereof,' i.e., of the soul. An eternal influence of objects, an influence of objects the effect of which, in the shape of a continued stream, has had no commencement,—not by *this*, either, is it possible that the bondage [of the soul] has been occasioned: such is the meaning.[2]

b. He states the reason of this [impossibility]:[3]

न बाह्याभ्यन्तरयोरुपरज्योपरञ्जकभावोऽपि[4] देशव्यवधानात्स्रुघ्नस्थपाटलिपुत्रस्थयोरिव[5] ॥ २८ ॥

---

1 Instead of -निमित्तकः, Aniruddha has the substantially equivalent -निमित्तः. *Ed.*

2 अस्यात्मनः । अनादिविषयोपरागः प्रवाहरूपेणानादिकार्यो विषयवासना तन्निमित्तकोऽपि बन्धो न संभवतीत्यर्थः ॥

3 अत्र हेतुमाह ॥

4 Dr. Ballantyne had, most probably by mere oversight, the unauthorized बाह्यान्तर°, which I have corrected. The reading उपरज्य°, here followed, is, perhaps, that of Aniruddha. उपरञ्ज्य° is the form of the word recognized by Vijnána; and I know of no manuscript warrant for the alteration of it seen in the following page, 1,—an extract from his commentary. It is, further, a regular derivative, which the other is not, if it is not even unjustified by grammatical prescription. *Ed.*

5 Aniruddha has -भेद°, 'division,' in place of -व्यवधान°, 'separation.' *Ed.*

A thing cannot act where it is not.

Aph. 28. Also [in my opinion, as well as in yours, apparently], between the external and the internal there is not the relation of influenced and influencer; because there is a local separation; as there is between him that stays at Srughna and him that stays at Páṭaliputra.

a. In the opinion of these [persons whose theory we are at present objecting to], the soul is circumscribed, residing entirely within the body; and that which is thus *within* cannot stand in the relation of the influenced and the influencer, as regards an *external* object. Why? Because they are separated in regard to place; like two persons the one of whom remains in Srughna and the other in Páṭaliputra: such is the meaning. Because the affection which we call 'influence' (*vásaná*) is seen only when there is conjunction, such as that of madder and the cloth to which it gives its colour], or that of flowers and the flower-basket[1] [to which they impart their odour.]

b. By the word 'also' the absence of conjunction [between the soul and objects (see § 15)], &c., which he himself holds, is connected[2] [with the matter of the present aphorism].

---

[1] तन्मते परिच्छिन्नो देहान्तरस्थ एवात्मा तस्याभ्यन्तरस्य न बाह्यविषयेण सहोपरज्योपरञ्जकभावोऽपि संभवति। कुतः। सुघ्नस्थपाटलिपुत्रस्थयोरिव देशव्यवधानादित्यर्थः। संयोगे सत्येव हि वासनाख्य उपरागो दृष्टो यथा मञ्जिष्ठावस्त्रयोर्यथा वा पुष्पपुटकयोरिति॥

[2] अपिशब्देन स्वमते संयोगाभावादिः समुच्चीयते॥

c. Srughna and Páṭaliputra [Palibothra, or Patna] are two several places far apart.[1]

d. But then [these heretics may reply], 'The influence of objects [on the soul] may be asserted, because there *is* a contact with the object; inasmuch as the soul, according to *us*, goes to the place of the object, just as the senses, according to Your Worship.' Therefore he declares [as follows]:

द्वयोरेकदेशलब्धोपरागान्न व्यवस्था ॥ २९ ॥

On the heretical view, the free soul would be equally liable to bondage.

Aph. 29. [It is impossible that the soul's bondage should arise] from an influence received in the same place [where the object is; because, in that case], there would be no distinction between the two, [the bond and the free].

a. To complete the sense, we must supply as follows: 'It is impossible that the bondage should arise from an influence received in one and the same place with the object.' Why? Because there would be no distinction between the two, the soul bound and the soul free; because bondage would [in that case] befall the liberated soul, also; [the free soul, according to this hypothesis, being just as likely to come across objects as any other]: such is the meaning.[3]

---

[1] स्रुघ्नपाटलिपुत्त्रौ विप्रकृष्टदेशविशेषौ ॥

[2] ननु भवतामिन्द्रियाणामिवास्माकमात्मनो विषयदेशगमनाद्विषयसंयोगेन विषयोपरागो वक्तव्यः । तत्राह ॥

[3] एकस्मिन्विषयदेशे लब्धादुपरागाद्बन्धो न

b. Here he ponders a doubt:[1]

अदृष्टवशाच्चेत् ॥ ३० ॥

The heretic's attempted defence.

Aph. 30. If [the heretic, wishing to save his theory, suggests that a difference between the two cases (see § 29) *does* exist] in virtue of the *unseen*, [i.e., of merit and demerit, then he will find his answer in the next aphorism].

a. That is to say, [the heretic may argue]: 'But then, granting that they [the free soul and the bound] are alike in respect of their coming into contact with objects, when they become conjoined with them in one and the same locality; yet the *reception of the influence* may result merely from the force of the *unseen*, [i.e., from the merit and demerit of this or that soul; the soul that is liberated alike from merit and demerit being able to encounter, with impunity, the object that would enchain one differently circumstanced]': if[2] [*this* be urged, then we look forward].

a. This he disputes,[3] [as follows]:

न द्वयोरेककालायोगादुपकार्योपकारकभावः ॥ ३१ ॥

संभवतीति शेषः। कुतः। यस्माद्वयोर्बद्धमुक्तात्मनोर्न व्यवस्था मुक्तस्यापि बन्धापत्तेरित्यर्थः ॥

[1] अत्र शङ्कते ॥

[2] नन्वेकदेशसंबन्धेन विषयसंयोगसाम्येऽप्यदृष्टवशादेवोपरागलाभ इति चेदित्यर्थः ॥

[3] परिहरति ॥

Each back must bear its own burden.

Aph. 31. They cannot stand in the relation of deserver and bestower, since the two do not belong to one and the same time.

a. Since, in thy opinion, the agent and the patient are distinct, and do not belong to the same time [believing, as thou heretically dost, not only that *objects* (see § 26. *b.*) momentarily perish and are replaced, but that the duration of *souls*, also, is of a like description], there is positively no such relation [between the soul at one time and its successor at another] as that of deserver and bestower [or transmitter of its merits or demerits]; because it is impossible that there should be an influence of objects [§ 27] taking effect on a patient [say, the soul of to-day], occasioned by the 'unseen' [merit or demerit] belonging to an agent [say, the soul of yesterday, which, on the hypothesis in question, is a numerically different individual]: such is the meaning.[1]

b. He ponders a doubt:[2]

पुत्रकर्मवदिति चेत् ॥ ३२ ॥

Whether merit may, or may not, be imputed.

Aph. 32. If [the heretic suggests that] the case is like that of the ceremonies in regard to a son, [then he will find his reply by looking forward].

a. But then [the heretic, admitting the principle that

---

[1] तव मते कर्तृभोक्त्रोर्भेदादेककालासंबन्धाच्च नैवोपकार्योपकारकभावो नहि कर्तृनिष्ठादृष्टेन भोक्तृनिष्ठो विषयोपरागः संभवतीत्यर्थः ॥

[2] शङ्कते ॥

the merit or demerit of an act belongs entirely to the agent, may urge that], as the son is benefited by ceremonies in regard to a son, such as that [ceremony (see Colebrooke's 'Hindú Law,' Vol. III., p. 104) celebrated] in anticipation of conception, which [no doubt] belongs to the *father* [who performs the ceremonies, to propitiate the gods], in like manner there may be an influence of objects on the experiencer [say, the soul of to-day], through the 'unseen' [merit or demerit] that belongs even to a different subject [say, the soul of yesterday]: such is the meaning[1] [of the heretic].

b. He refutes this, by showing that the illustration is not a fact:[2]

नास्ति हि तत्र स्थिर एक आत्मा यो गर्भाधानादिना[3] संस्क्रियेत[4] ॥ ३३ ॥

This will not help the heretic's argument.

Aph. 33. [Your illustration proves nothing;] for, in that case, there is no one permanent soul which could be consecrated by the ceremonies in anticipation of conception, &c.

a. 'In that case,' i.e., on thy theory, too, the benefit of

---

[1] ननु यथा पितृनिष्ठेन गर्भाधानादिना पुत्रकर्मणा पुत्रस्योपकारो भवति तद्वद्व्यधिकरणेनैवादृष्टेन भोक्तुर्विषयोपरागः स्यादित्यर्थः ॥

[2] दृष्टान्तासिद्ध्या परिहरति ॥

[3] Aniruddha has गर्भाधानादिकर्मणा; and Dr. Ballantyne's rendering suits it. *Ed.*

[4] A common reading, but inferior, is संस्क्रियते. *Ed.*

the son, by [means of the performance of][1] the ceremonies in anticipation of conception, &c., could not take place; 'for,' i.e., because, on that theory, there is not one [self-identical] soul, continuing from the [time of] conception to birth, which could be consecrated [by the ceremonies in question], so as to be a fit subject for the duties that pertain to the time subsequent to birth [such as the investiture with the sacred thread, for which the young Bráhman would not be a fit subject, if the ceremonies in anticipation of his conception had been omitted]: and thus your illustration is not a real one,[2] [on your *own* theory: it is not a thing that you can assert as a fact].

b. And, according to *my* theory, also, your illustration is not a fact; seeing that it *is* possible that the benefit to the son should arise from the 'unseen' [merit] deposited in the son by means of the ceremony regarding the son: for it is an implied tenet [of my school], that it [the soul] is permanent [in its self-identity]; and there is the injunction[3] [of Manu, (Ch. II., v. 26), with regard to the ceremonies in question, which proceeds on the same grounds].

---

[1] The brackets are of my inserting. *Ed.*

[2] तत्र त्वन्मते गर्भाधानादिकर्मणापि पुत्रस्योपकारो न घटते हि यस्मात्तत्र गर्भाधानमारभ्य जन्मपर्यन्तस्थाय्येक आत्मा नास्ति यो जन्मोत्तरकालीनकर्माधिकारार्थं संस्क्रियेतेति तथा च दृष्टान्तासिद्धिः ॥

[3] अस्मन्मतेऽपि स्थैर्याभ्युपगमाद्वचनाच्च पुत्रकर्मणा पुत्रनिष्ठादृष्टोत्पत्तेः पुत्रोपकारसंभवाद्दृष्टान्तस्यासिद्धिरित्यर्थः ॥

c. Some other heretic may encounter us, on the strength of [the argument here next stated, viz.,] 'But then, since *bondage*, also, [like everything else] is momentary, let this bondage have nothing determinate for its cause, or *nothing at all* for its cause,'[1] [which view of matters is propounded in the next aphorism]:

स्थिरकार्यासिद्धेः क्षणिकत्वम् ॥ ३४ ॥

Whether bondage may not be momentary, and so require no cause.

Aph. 34. Since there is no such thing as a permanent result [on the heretical view], the momentariness [of bondage, also, is to be admitted].

a. '*Of bondage*': this must be supplied, [to complete the aphorism].[2]

b. And thus the point relied on is, that it [i.e., bondage] have no cause at all. And so this is the application [of the argument, viz.]:

(1) Bondage, &c., is momentary;
(2) Because it exists,
(3) [Everything that exists is momentary,] as the apex of the lamp-flame, or the like.[3]

---

[1] ननु बन्धस्यापि क्षणिकत्वादनियतकारणकोऽभावकारणको वा बन्धोऽस्त्वित्याशयेनापरो नास्तिकः प्रत्यवतिष्ठते ॥

[2] बन्धस्येति शेषः ॥

[3] तथा चाकारणक एवास्त्वित्याशयः । तथा चायं प्रयोगो बन्धादिकं क्षणिकं सत्त्वाद्दीपशिखादिवदिति ॥

c. And [continues the heretic,] this [reason, viz., 'existence'] does not extend *unduly*[1] [as you may object,] to the case of a jar, or the like; because *that,* also [in my opinion], is like the subject in dispute, [in being momentary]. This [in fact] is precisely what is asserted in the expression, 'since there is *no such thing* as a permanent result'[2] [§34].

d. He objects[3] [to this heretical view]:

न प्रत्यभिज्ञाबाधात् ॥ ३५ ॥

The fact of recognition proves that things are not momentary.

Aph. 35. No, [things are *not* momentary in their duration]; for the absurdity of this is proved by *recognition.*

a. That is to say: nothing is momentary; because the absurdity of its being momentary follows from the opposite argument [to that under §34. *b.*], taken from such facts of recognition as, 'what I saw, that same do I touch,' [an argument which may be stated as follows], viz.:

(1) Bondage, &c., is permanent;

(2) Because it exists,

---

[1] *Vyabhichára* is the expression here paraphrased. In this work and others, the translator has given it many meanings; and so has Colebrooke, who renders it, in various contexts, by 'contradiction,' 'derogation,' 'failure,' 'impossibility,' 'unoperativeness,' &c. As a logical technicality, it denotes the presentation of the reason, or middle term, unaccompanied by the major term. *Ed.*

[2] न च घटादौ व्यभिचारस्तस्यापि पक्षसमत्वात् । एतदेवोक्तं स्थिरकार्यासिद्धेरित्यनेन ॥

[3] दूषयति ॥

(3) [Everything that exists is permanent,] as a jar, or the like.[1]

श्रुतिन्यायविरोधाच्च ॥ ३६ ॥

That things are momentary is contradicted by Scripture and reasoning.

Aph. 36. And [things are not momentary;] because this is contradicted by Scripture and by reasoning.

a. That is to say: nothing is momentary; because the general principle, that the whole world, consisting of effects and causes, is momentary, is contradicted by such texts as this, viz., '[All] this, O ingenuous one, was antecedently existing,' and by such Scriptural and other arguments as this, viz., 'How should what exists proceed from the non-existent?'[2]

दृष्टान्तासिद्धेश्च ॥ ३७ ॥

The heretic's illustration is not a truth.

Aph. 37. And [we reject the argument of this heretic;] because his instance is not a fact.

---

[1] न कस्यापि क्षणिकत्वं यदद्राक्षं तदेवाहं स्पृशामीत्यादिप्रत्यभिज्ञानुगृहीतेन बन्धाधिकं स्थिरं सत्त्वाद्घटादिवदिति प्रत्यनुमानेन क्षणिकत्वस्य बाधादित्यर्थः ॥

[2] सदेव सौम्येदमग्र आसीदित्यादिश्रुतिभिः कथमसतः सज्जायेतेत्यादिश्रौतादियुक्तिभिश्च कार्यकारणात्मकाखिलप्रपञ्चे क्षणिकत्वानुमानस्य विरोधान्न क्षणिकत्वं कस्यापीत्यर्थः ॥

a. That is to say: the general principle of the momentariness [of all things] is denied; because this momentary character does not [in fact] belong to the apex of the lamp-flame, &c., the instance [on which thou, heretic, dost ground thy generalization, (§ 34. *b.*)]. Moreover, thou quite errest in regard to momentariness, in that instance, from not taking account of the minute and numerous instants [really included in a duration which seems to thee momentary]: such is the import.[1]

If things were momentary, there could be no relation of cause and effect.

b. Moreover, if the momentary duration, &c., [of things] be asserted, then there can be no such thing as the relation of cause and effect, in the case of the earth and the jar, and the like. And you must not say that there *is* no such thing as that [relation of cause and effect]; because it is proved to be a reality by the fact that, otherwise, there would be no such thing as the efforts of him who desires an effect, [and who, therefore, sets in operation the causes adapted to its production]. With reference to this, he declares [as follows]:[2]

युगपज्जायमानयोर्न कार्यकारणभावः ॥ ३८ ॥

---

[1] दृष्टान्ते दीपशिखादौ क्षणिकत्वस्यासिद्धेर्न क्षणिकत्वानुमानमित्यर्थः । किं च सूक्ष्मानेकक्षणानाकलनेन क्षणिकत्वभ्रम एव तत्र तवेति भावः॥

[2] किं च क्षणिकत्ववादे मृद्घटादिस्थले कार्यकारणभावो नोपपद्यते । न च नास्त्येव स इति वाच्यं कार्यार्थिनः प्रवृत्त्यन्यथानुपपत्त्या तत्सिद्धेरित्यभिप्रेत्याह ॥

The causal relation is not between things that arise simultaneously.

Aph. 38. It is not between two things coming simultaneously into existence, that the relation of cause and effect exists.

a. Let us ask, does the relation of product and [material] cause exist between the earth and the jar, as *simultaneously* coming into [their supposed momentary] existence, or as successive? Not the first; because there is nothing to lead to such an inference, and because we should not [in that case] find the man, who wants a jar, operating with earth, &c., [with a view to the jar's *subsequent* production]. Neither is it the last; in regard to which he declares [as follows] :[1]

पूर्वापाय उत्तरायोगात् ॥ ३९ ॥

A product cannot survive its substantial cause.

Aph. 39. Because, when the antecedent departs, the consequent is unfit [to arise, and survive it].

a. The relation of cause and effect is, further, inconsistent with the theory of the momentary duration of things; because, at the time when the antecedent, i. e., the cause, departs, the consequent, i.e., the product, is 'unfit,' i.e., is not competent to arise; because, that is to say, a product is cognized only by its inhering in [and being substantially identical with, however formally different from,] its

---

[1] किं मृद्घटयोर्युगपज्जायमानयोः कार्यकारणभावः किं वा क्रमिकयोः। नाद्यो विनिगमकाभावाद्घटार्थिनो मृदादिप्रवृत्त्यनुपपत्तेश्च। नान्त्य इत्याह ॥

substantial cause,[1] [and is incapable, therefore, of surviving it].

b. With reference to this same [topic, viz., the] substantial cause, he mentions another [the converse] objection[2] [to the theory of the momentary duration of things]:

तद्भावे तदयोगादुभयव्यभिचारादपि न ॥ ४० ॥

The coexistence of substance and product is impossible, if things be momentary.

Aph. 40. Moreover, not [on the theory of the momentary duration of things, can there be such a relation as that of cause and effect]; because, while the one [the antecedent] exists, the other [the consequent] is incompatible, because the two keep always asunder.[3]

a. To complete [the aphorism], we must say, 'moreover, [on the theory objected to], there can be no such relation as that of cause and effect; because, at the time when the antecedent exists, the consequent cannot coexist with it, the two being mutually exclusive.'[4] The two suggesters of the relation of cause and effect, in product and sub

---

[1] पूर्वस्य कारणस्यापायकाल उत्तरस्य कार्यस्यायोगादुत्पत्त्यनौचित्यादपि न क्षणिकत्ववादे संभवति कार्यकारणभाव उपादानकारणानुगततयैव कार्यानुभवादित्यर्थः ॥

[2] उपादानकारणमधिकृत्यैव दूषणान्तरमाह ॥

[3] For *vyabhichára*, the word used in the original, see 1, at p. 38, *supra*. *Ed.*

[4] Here again occurs, in the Sanskrit, the term *vyabhichára*. *Ed.*

stance,[1] are (1) this concomitancy of affirmatives, that, while the product exists, the substance thereof exists. and (2) this concomitancy of negatives,[2] that, when the substance no longer exists, the product no longer exists : and these two [conditions, on *your* theory] cannot be ; because, since things [in your opinion,] are momentary in their duration, the two [viz., the substance and the product], inasmuch as they are antecedent and consequent,[3] belong to opposite times,[4] [and cannot, therefore, coexist; for the product, according to you, does not come into existence until its substance has perished, which is contrary to the nature of the causal relation just defined].

b. But then, [the heretic may say, do not let the *coexistence* of substance and product be insisted upon, as indispensable to the causal relation between the two, but] 'let the nature of a cause belong to the substantial cause,

---

[1] I have inserted the words 'in product and substance.' *Ed.*

[2] The original dual of 'concomitancy of affirmatives' and 'concomitancy of negatives' is *anwayavyatirekau.* For other English equivalents of this term, occurring in the singular number, see Book VI., Aph. 15 and 63. *Ed.*

[3] 'Antecedent and consequent' renders *kramika*, translated 'successive' in Aph. 38, *a*, at p. 41, *supra.* *Ed.*

[4] 'पूर्वस्य भावकाल उत्तरस्यासंबन्धादुभयव्यभिचारादपि न कार्यकारणभाव इति शेषः। यदोपादेयं तदोपादानं यदोपादानाभावस्तदोपादेयाभाव इत्यन्वयव्यतिरेका उपादेयोपादानयोः कार्यकारणभावग्राहकौ तौ च क्षणिकत्वेन क्रमिकयोस्तयोर्विरुद्धकालत्वान्न संभवतः॥

as it belongs to the *instrumental* cause, in respect merely of its *antecedence*.' To this he replies :[1]

पूर्वभावमात्रे न नियमः ॥ ४१ ॥

Antecedence to the product does not distinguish the Matter from the Instrument.

Aph. 41. If there were merely *antecedence*, then there would be no determination [of a substantial or material cause, as distinguished from an instrumental cause].

a. And it could not be determined that this was the *substance* [of this or that product], on the granting of nothing more than its *antecedence* [to the product]; because antecedence constitutes no distinction between it and the *instrumental* causes; for, [as we need scarcely remind you], that there *is* a distinction between instrumental and substantial causes, the whole world is agreed: such is the meaning.[2]

The question whether anything exists besides Thought

b. Other heretics say: 'Since nothing [really] exists, except *Thought*, neither does *Bondage*; just as the things of a dream [have no real exist-

---

[1] ननु निमित्तकारणस्येवोपादानस्यापि पूर्वभावमात्रेणैव कारणतास्त्विति तत्राह ॥

[2] पूर्वभावमात्राभ्युपगमे चेदमेवोपादानमिति नियमो न स्यान्निमित्तकारणानामपि पूर्वभावाविशेषादीदृगेव हि निमित्तोपादानयोर्विभागः सर्वलोकसिद्ध इत्यर्थः ॥

ence]. Therefore it has *no* cause; for it is absolutely *false*.' He rejects the opinion of these[1] [heretics]:

न विज्ञानमात्रं बाह्यप्रतीतेः ॥ ४२ ॥

We have the evidence of Intuition for the External, as well as for the Internal.

Aph. 42. Not Thought alone exists; because there is the intuition of the external.

a. That is to say: the *reality* is not *Thought* alone; because external objects, also, are proved to exist, just as Thought is, by intuition.[2]

b. But then [these heretics may rejoin], 'From the example of intuitive perception in *dreams* [see Butler's 'Analogy,' Part I., Ch. I.], we find this [your supposed evidence of objective reality] to exist, even in the *absence* of objects!' To this he replies:[3]

तदभावे तदभावाच्छून्यं तर्हि ॥ ४३ ॥

The denial of the external amounts to Nihilism.

Aph. 43. Then, since, if the one does not exist, the other does not exist, there is a void, [i.e., nothing exists at all].

---

[1] अपरे नास्तिका आहुः । विज्ञानातिरिक्तवस्तुभावेन बन्धोऽपि स्वप्नपदार्थवत् । अतोऽत्यन्तमिथ्यात्वेन न तत्र कारणमस्तीति तन्मतमपाकरोति ॥

[2] न विज्ञानमात्रं तत्त्वं बाह्यार्थानामपि विज्ञानवत्प्रतीतिसिद्धत्वादित्यर्थः ॥

[3] ननु स्वप्नप्रतीतिदृष्टान्तेन विषयाभावेऽपि तदुपपत्तिरिति । तत्राह ॥

a. That is to say: if external things do not exist, then a mere *void* offers itself. Why? Because, if the external does not exist, then *thought* does not exist; for it is *intuition* that proves the objective: and, if the intuition of the external did not establish the objective, then the intuition of *thought*, also, would not establish [the existence of] thought.[1]

b. 'Then *let* the reality be a mere void; and, therefore, the searching for the cause of Bondage is unfitting, *just because a void is all:*' with such a proposal [as recorded in the next aphorism] does [some one who may claim the title of] the very crest-gem of the heretics rise up in opposition:[2]

शून्यं तत्त्वं भावो विनश्यति वस्तुधर्मत्वाद्विनाशस्य ॥ ४४ ॥

The heretic goes the length of asserting sheer Nihilism.

Aph. 44. The reality is a void: what is perishes; because to perish is the habit of things.

a. The void alone [says this prince of heretics, or the fact that nothing exists at all] is the reality, [or the only

---

[1] तर्हि बाह्याभावे शून्यं प्रसज्येत। कुतः। बाह्याभावे विज्ञानाभावात्प्रतीतिर्हि विषयसाधिका बाह्यप्रतीतिश्चेन्न विषयं साधयेद्विज्ञानप्रतीतिरपि न विज्ञानं साधयेदिति भावः॥

[2] अस्तु तर्हि शून्यमेव तत्त्वमतश्च बन्धकारणान्वेषणमयुक्तं तुच्छत्वादिति नास्तिकशिरोमणिः प्रत्यवतिष्ठते॥

truth]. Since everything that exists perishes, and that which is perishable is false, as is a dream, therefore, as of all things the beginnings and endings are merely nonentities, Bondage, &c., in the midst [of any beginning and ending], has merely a momentary existence,—is phenomenal, and not real. Therefore, *who* can be bound by *what?* This [question] is what we rest upon. The reason assigned for the perishableness of whatever exists is, 'because to perish is the habit of things;' because to perish is the *very nature* of things: but nothing continues, after quitting its own *nature;* [so that nothing could continue, if it *ceased* to perish]: such is the meaning.[1]

b. He rejects[2] [this heretical view]:

अपवादमात्रमबुद्धानाम् ॥ ४५ ॥

Nihilism denied; as the indiscerptible is indestructible.

Aph. 45. This is a mere counter-assertion of unintelligent persons.

a. 'Of unintelligent persons,' i.e., of blockheads, this is 'a mere counter-assertion,' i.e., a mere *idle* counter-assertion, that a thing must needs be perishable, *because it*

---

[1] शून्यमेव तत्त्वम् । यतः सर्वो ऽपि भावो विनश्यति यश्च विनाशी स मिथ्या स्वप्नवदतः सर्ववस्तूनामाद्यन्तयोरभावमात्रत्वान्मध्ये क्षणिकसत्त्वं सांवृत्तिकं न पारमार्थिकं बन्धादि। ततः किं केन बध्येत इत्याशयः । भावानां विनाशित्वे हेतुर्वस्तुधर्मत्वाद्विनाशस्येति विनाशस्य वस्तुस्वभावत्वात्स्वभावं तु विहाय न पदार्थस्तिष्ठतीत्यर्थः ॥

[2] परिहरति ॥

exists; [and such an assertion is idle,] because things that are not made up of parts, since there is no cause of the destruction of such things, cannot perish.[1]

b. [But] what need of many words? It is not the fact, that even *products* perish; [for] just as, by the cognition that 'the jar is old' [we mean that it has passed from the condition of new to that of old], so, too, by such a cognition as this, that 'the jar has passed away,' it is settled only that the jar, or the like, *is in the condition* of having passed away.[2]

c. He states another objection[3] [to the heretical view]:

उभयपक्षसमानक्षेमत्वादयमपि[4]॥ ४६ ॥

Nihilism is open to the same objections as both the Momentary and the Ideal theories.

Aph. 46. Moreover, this [nihilistic theory is not a right one]; because it has the same fortune as both the views [which were confuted just before].

---

[1] अबुद्धानां मूढानामपवादमात्रं भावत्वाद्विनाशित्वमिति मिथ्यापवाद एव नाशकारणाभावेन निरवयवद्रव्याणां नाशासंभवात् ॥

[2] किं बहुना। कार्याणामपि न विनाशसिद्धिः। घटो जीर्ण इति प्रत्ययेनेव घटोऽतीत इत्यादिप्रत्ययेनापि घटादेरतीताख्याया अवस्थाया एव सिद्धेः ॥

[3] दूषणान्तरमाह ॥

[4] Aniruddha, according to the MSS. which I have seen, reads -क्षेमाद॰. *Ed.*

a. This view, moreover [§ 44], is not a good one; because it has the same fortune as, i. e., is open to similar reasons for rejection as, the theory that external things are momentary [§ 26. *b.*], and as the theory that nothing exists besides Thought [§ 41. *b*]. The reason for the rejection of the theory that things are momentary in their duration, viz. [as stated in § 35], the fact of *recognition*, &c., [which is, at least, as little consistent with Nihilism as it is with the momentary duration of things], and the reason for the rejection of the theory that nothing exists besides Thought, viz. [as stated in § 42], the intuition of the external, &c., apply equally here [in the case of Nihilism]: such is the import.[1]

b. Moreover, as for the opinion which is accepted by these [heretics], viz., '*Let the mere void* [of absolute nonentity] be the soul's aim [and *summum bonum*], since herein consist at once the cessation of pain [which cannot continue, when there is absolutely *nothing*], and also the means thereof [since there can be no further means required for the removal of anything, if it be settled that the thing positively does not exist],' this, too, can hardly be: so he declares [as follows]:[2]

---

[1] क्षणिकबाह्यपक्षेण विज्ञानमात्रपक्षेण सह समानक्षेमत्वात्तुल्यनिरसनहेतुकत्वादयमपि पक्षो न सम्यक् । क्षणिकपक्षनिरासहेतुः प्रत्यभिज्ञादिर्विज्ञानपक्षनिरासहेतुर्बाह्यप्रतीत्यादिश्चात्रापि समान इति भावः ॥

[2] यदपि दुःखनिवृत्तिरूपतया तत्साधनतया च शून्यस्यैवास्तु पुरुषार्थत्वमिति तैर्मन्यते तदपि दुर्घटमित्याह ॥

अपुरुषार्थत्वमुभयथा ॥ ४७ ॥

The soul's aim is not annihilation.

Aph. 47. In neither way [whether as a means, or as an end,] is this [annihilation] the soul's aim.

a. 'Let the void [of mere nonentity] be the soul's aim, whether as consisting in the cessation of pain, or as presenting the means for the cessation of pain,' [says the heretic. And this cannot be; because the [whole] world agrees, that the aim of the soul consists in the joys, &c., that shall abide *in it*; that is to say, because [*they* hold, while] *you* do not hold, that there is a *permanent* soul, [(see § 33) in respect of which the liberation or beatification would be possible, or even predicable].[1]

b. Now [certain] other things, also, entertained, as causes of [the soul's] bondage, by [imperfectly instructed] believers, remaining over and above those [proposed by unbelievers, and] already rejected, are to be set aside:[2]

न गतिविशेषात् ॥ ४८ ॥

It is by no movement that the soul gets into bondage.

Aph. 48. Not from any kind of motion [such as its entrance into a body, does the soul's bondage result].

---

[1] दुःखनिवृत्तिरूपतया दुःखनिवृत्तिसाधनतया वा शून्यस्य पुरुषार्थत्वं स्यात्। तच्च न घटते स्वनिष्ठत्वेनैव सुखादीनां लोके पुरुषार्थत्वावगमात्स्थिरस्य पुरुषस्यानङ्गीकारादित्यर्थः ॥

[2] इदानीं पूर्वनिरस्तावशिष्टान्यास्तिकसंभाव्यान्यप्यन्यानि बन्धकारणानि निरस्यन्ते ॥

a. 'Bondage' [required to complete the aphorism] is understood from the topic[1] [of discussion].

b. The meaning is, that the soul's bondage, moreover, does not result from any sort of *motion*, in the shape, for instance, of its entrance into a body.[2]

c. He states a reason for this:[3]

निष्क्रियस्य तदसंभवात् ॥ ४९ ॥

What is all-pervading does not change place.

Aph. 49. Because this is impossible for what is inactive, [or, in other words, without motion].

a. That is to say: because this is impossible, i.e., *motion* is impossible, in the case of the soul, which is inactive, [because] all-pervading, [and, therefore, incapable of changing its place].[4]

b. But then [the objector may say], 'Since, in the books of Scripture and of law, we hear of its *going* and *coming* into this world and the other world, let soul be [not all-pervading, as you allege, but] merely limited [in its extent]: and to this effect, also, is the text, 'Of the size

---

[1] प्रकरणाद्बन्धो लभ्यते ॥

[2] गतिविशेषाच्छरीरप्रवेशादिरूपादपि पुरुषस्य न बन्ध इत्यर्थः ॥

[3] अत्र हेतुमाह ॥

[4] निष्क्रियस्य विभोः पुरुषस्य तदसंभवाद्गत्यसंभवादित्यर्थः ॥

of the thumb is the soul, the inner spirit,' and the like:[1] [but] this conjecture he repels:[2]

मूर्त्तत्वाद्घटादिवत्समानधर्मापत्तावपसिद्धान्तः॥५०॥

Were the soul limited, it might be perishable.

Aph. 50. [We cannot admit that the soul is other than all-pervading; because] by its being limited, since it would come under the same conditions as jars, &c., there would be a contradiction to our tenet [of its imperishableness].

a. That is to say: and, if the soul were admitted to be, like a jar, or the like, limited, i.e. circumscribed [in dimension], then, since it would resemble a jar, or the like, in being made up of parts, and [hence] in being perishable, &c., this would be contrary to our settled principle,[3] [that the soul is imperishable].

b. He now justifies the text [see § 49. *b.*] referring to the *motion*[4] [of the soul, by showing that the motion is not really of the soul, but of an accessory]:

---

[1] *Śwetáśwatara Upanishad*, iii., 13. *Ed.*

[2] ननु श्रुतिस्मृत्योरिहलोकपरलोकगमनागमनश्रवणात्पुरुषस्य परिच्छिन्नत्वमेवास्तु तथा च श्रुतिरप्यङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषोऽन्तरात्मेत्यादिरित्याशङ्कामपाकरोति॥

[3] यदि च घटादिवत्पुमान्मूर्त्तः परिच्छिन्नः स्वीक्रियते तदा सावयवत्वविनाशित्वादिना घटादिसमानधर्मापत्तावपसिद्धान्तः स्यादित्यर्थः॥

[4] गतिश्रुतिमुपपादयति॥

गतिश्रुतिरप्युपाधियोगादाकाशवत् ॥ ५१ ॥

Soul moves not, any more than Space.

Aph. 51. The text regarding the *motion* [of the soul], moreover, is [applicable, only] because of the junction of an *attendant*;[1] as in the case of the Ether [or *Space*, which moves not, though we talk of the space enclosed in a jar, as moving with the jar].

a. Since there are such proofs of the soul's unlimitedness, as the declaration that 'It is eternal, omnipresent, permanent,'[2] the text[3] regarding its *motion* is to be explained as having reference to a movement pertaining [not to the soul, but] to an attendant; for there is the text, 'As the Ether [or space] included in a jar, when the jar is removed, [in this case] the *jar* may be removed, but not the space; and in like manner is the soul, which is like the sky, [incapable of being moved]';[4] and because we may conclude that the motion [erroneously supposed to belong to the soul (49. *b.*),] belongs to *Nature* [see *Vedánta Aphorisms*, Part I., §4. *l.*], from such maxims[3] as this, that '*Nature* does the works the fruits of which are blissful or baneful;

---

[1] *Upádhi;* often, below, 'investment' and 'adjunct.' *Ed.*

[2] *Bhagavad-gítá*, ii., 24. *Ed.*

[3] 'Text' and 'maxim' are here meant to represent *śruti* and *smṛiti*, taken in their more limited senses. Elsewhere the translator has, for the same terms, in wider acceptations, 'books of Scripture and of law,' &c. The first is 'revealed law,' the Vedas; the second, 'memorial law,' or a code of such law, as the *Mánava*, and also any composition of a man reputed to be inspired. Both are held to have originated from a superhuman source; but only the former is regarded as preserving the very words of revelation. *Ed.*

[4] The anacoluthism observable in the translation follows that of the original, with reference to which see the *Indische Studien*, vol. ii., p. 61.

and it is wilful *Nature* that, in the three worlds, reaps these': such is the import.[1] [2]

b. It has already been denied [§ 16] that the bondage [of the soul] is occasioned by works, in the shape either of enjoined or of forbidden actions. Now he declares that the bondage, moreover, does not arise from the 'unseen' [merit or demerit] resulting therefrom:[3]

न कर्मणाप्यतद्धर्मत्वात् ॥ ५२ ॥

The bondage of the soul is no result of any merit or demerit

Aph. 52. Nor, moreover, [does the bondage of the soul result from the merit or demerit arising] from works; because these belong not thereto.

a. That is to say: the bondage of the soul does not arise directly from the 'unseen' [merit or demerit] occa-

---

[1] नित्यः सर्वगतः स्थाणुरित्यादिना प्रमाणेनात्मनोऽपरिच्छिन्नत्वे गतिश्रुतिरौपाधिकगतिपरा व्याख्येया। घटसंवृतमाकाशं नीयमाने घटे यथा। घटो नीयेत नाकाशं तद्वज्जीवो नभोपमः। इति श्रुतेः। प्रकृतिः कुरुते कर्म शुभाशुभफलात्मकम्। प्रकृतिश्च तदश्नाति त्रिषु लोकेषु कामगा। इत्यादिस्मृत्या गतेः प्रकृतिनिष्ठत्वावगमाच्चेति भावः॥

[2] For another rendering, see my translation of the *Rational Refutation*, &c., p. 57. *Ed.*

[3] पूर्वं विहितनिषिद्धव्यापाररूपेण कर्मणा बन्धो निराकृतः। इदानीं तज्जन्यादृष्टेनापि न बन्ध इत्याह॥

sioned by works.[1] Why? Because this is no property thereof, i.e., because this [merit or demerit (see § 16. *a.*)] is no property of the soul.[2]

b. But then [some one may say], '*Let* it be that the bondage resulting from the 'unseen,' i.e., the merit [or demerit] even of another, should attach to a different person;' whereupon he declares [as follows]:[3]

अतिप्रसक्तिरन्यधर्मत्वे ॥ ५३ ॥[4]

Else, bondage might cling even to the emancipated.

Aph. 53. If the case were otherwise [than as I say], then it [the bondage of the soul] might extend unduly, [even to the emancipated].

a. That is to say: if the case were otherwise, if bondage and its cause were under other conditions [than we have declared them to be], then there might be an undue extension; bondage would befall even the emancipated,[5] [for the same reasons as those stated under § 16. *a.*].

---

[1] Dr. Ballantyne should have taken 'unseen' and 'works' as in apposition, and should have made the former explanatory of the latter. Clearer than his original, and yielding substantially his sense, is the gloss of Vedánti Mahádeva: कर्मणा तज्जन्यादृष्टेनापि न पुंसः साक्षाद्बन्धः । *Ed.*

[2] कर्मणादृष्टेनापि साक्षान्न पुरुषस्य बन्धः । कुतः । अतद्धर्मत्वात्पुरुषधर्मत्वाभावादित्यर्थः ॥

[3] नन्वन्यधर्मेणाप्यदृष्टेनान्यस्य बन्धः स्यात्तत्राह ॥

[4] Aniruddha transposes Aphorisms 53 and 54. *Ed.*

[5] अन्यधर्मत्वे बन्धतत्कारणयोरन्यधर्मत्वेऽतिप्रसक्तिर्मुक्तस्यापि बन्धापत्तिरित्यर्थः ॥

b. What need of so much [prolixity]? He states a general objection why the bondage of soul cannot result from any one or other [of these causes], beginning with its essence [see § 6. *b.*], and ending with its [supposed] works [see § 16]; inasmuch as it is contrary to Scripture,[1] [that any one of these should be the cause]:

निर्गुणादिश्रुतिविरोधश्चेति ॥ ५४ ॥

A single text of Scripture upsets, equally, all the heretical notions of the soul's relation to bondage.

Aph. 54. And this [opinion, that the bondage of the soul arises from any of these causes alleged by the heretics,] is contrary to such texts as the one that declares it [the soul] to be without qualities: and so much for that point.

a. And, if the bondage of the soul arose from any one or other of those [supposed causes already treated of,] among which its essential character [§ 6. *b.*] is the first, this would be contradictory to such texts as, 'Witness, intelligent, alone, and without the [three] qualities [is the soul:'[2] such is the meaning.[3]

b. The expression 'and so much for that point' means,

---

[1] किं बहुना । स्वभावादिकर्मान्तैरन्येन वा केनापि पुरुषस्य बन्धोत्पत्तिर्न घटते श्रुतिविरोधादिति साधारणं बाधकमाह ॥

[2] *Swetáśwatara Upanishad*, vi., 11. *Ed.*

[3] स्वभावाद्यन्यतमेन पुरुषस्य बन्धोत्पत्तौ साक्षी चेता केवलो निर्गुणश्चेत्यादिश्रुतिविरोधश्चेत्यर्थः ॥

that the investigation of the cause of the bondage [of the soul] here closes.[1]

c. The case, then, stands thus: since [all] other [theories] are overthrown by the declaratory aphorisms, 'There would be no fitness in the enjoining' [see § 7], &c., it is ascertained that the immediate cause of the bondage [of the soul] is just the conjunction of Nature and of the soul.[2]

d. But then, in that case, [some one may say], this conjunction of Nature and of the soul [§ 54. *c.*], whether it be essential, or adventitiously caused by Time or something else [§ 5. *b.*], must occasion the bondage even of the *emancipated.* Having pondered this doubt, he disposes of it [as follows]:[3]

तद्योगोऽप्यविवेकान्न[4] समानत्वम् ॥ ५५ ॥

How the true cause of bondage affects not the emancipated.

Aph. 55. Moreover, the conjunction thereof does not, through non-discrimination, take place [in the case of the emancipated]; nor is there a parity,

---

[1] इतिशब्दो बन्धहेतुपरीक्षासमाप्तौ ॥

[2] तदेवं न स्वभावतो बद्धस्येत्यादिना प्रदर्शकेनेतरप्रतिषेधतः प्रकृतिपुरुषसंयोग एव साक्षाद्बन्धहेतुरवधारितः ॥

[3] ननु तत्र प्रकृतिपुरुषसंयोगोऽपि स्वाभाविकत्वे कालादिनिमित्तकत्वे वा मुक्तस्यापि बन्धापादक इत्याशङ्क्य समाधत्ते ॥

[4] तद्योगे, the reading which I find in MSS. of Aniruddha, seems to be indefensible. *Ed.*

[in this respect, between the emancipated and the unemancipated].

a. 'The conjunction thereof,' i.e., the conjunction of Nature and of the soul; this conjunction, moreover, does not take place again 'through non-discrimination,' i.e., through the want of a discrimination [between Nature and soul] in the emancipated, [who *do* discriminate, and who thus avoid the conjunction which others, failing to discriminate, incur, and thus fall into bondage]: such is the meaning. And thus the emancipated and the bound are *not* on a level, [under the circumstances stated at § 54. *c.*]: such is the import.[1]

[विपर्ययाद्बन्धः[2] ॥ ५६ ॥

The true cause of bondage, in other words, non-discrimination.

Aph. 56. Bondage arises from the error [of not discriminating between Nature and soul].

a. Having thus declared the cause of that [bondage]

---

[1] तद्योगः प्रकृतिपुरुषसंयोगो ऽप्यविवेकान्मुक्ते ऽविवेकाभावान्न पुनः संयोगो भवतीत्यर्थः । तथा च न मुक्तबद्धसाम्यमित्याशयः ॥

[2] These words, a bad reading of the 24th Aphorism of Book III., were pointed out, by me, as having, with the sentence of comment attached to them, no place here; and Dr. Ballantyne, when he republished the Sánkhya Aphorisms in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, omitted them. Hence the brackets now inserted, and my alteration of the numbering of the Aphorisms throughout the remainder of Book I. *Ed.*

which is to be got rid of, he declares the means of getting rid of it :[1]]

नियतकारणात्तदुच्छित्तिर्ध्वान्तवत् ॥ ५६ ॥

Non-discrimination is removable by discrimination alone.

Aph. 56. The removal of it is to be effected by the necessary means, just like darkness.

a. The necessary means, established throughout the world, in such cases as 'shell-silver' [i.e., a pearl-oyster-shell mistaken for silver], viz., the *immediacy* of discrimination, by *this* alone is 'its removal,' i.e., the removal of the non-discrimination [between Nature and soul], to be effected, and not by *works*, or the like: such is the meaning: just as darkness, the dark, is removed by light alone,[2] [and by no other means].

b. 'But then [some one may say], if merely the non-discrimination of Nature and soul be, through the conjunction [of the two, consequent on the want of discrimination], the cause of bondage, and if merely the discrimination of the two be the cause of liberation, then there would be liberation, even while there remained the conceit of [one's possessing] a body, &c.; and this is contrary to Scripture,

---

[[1] एवं हेयहेतुं प्रतिपाद्य हानोपायं प्रतिपादयति ॥]

[2] शुक्तिरजतादिस्थले लोकसिद्धं यन्नियतं कारणं विवेकसाक्षात्कारस्तत एव तदुच्छित्तिरविवेकोच्छित्तिर्न कर्मादिभिरित्यर्थो यथा ध्वान्तमन्धकारः प्रकाशेनैव नश्यति ॥

to the institutes of law, and to sound reasoning.' To this he replies:[1]

प्रधानाविवेकादन्याविवेकस्य तद्धाने हानम् ॥५७॥

The discrimination of Nature, as other than soul, involves all discrimination.

Aph. 57. Since the non-discrimination of other things [from soul] results from the non-discrimination of *Nature* [from soul], the cessation of this will take place, on the cessation of that [from which it results].

a. By reason of the non-discrimination of *Nature* from the soul, what non-discrimination of *other* things there *is*, such as the non-discrimination of the *understanding* [as something other than the soul], *this* necessarily ceases, on the cessation of the non-discrimination of Nature; because, when the non-discrimination of the understanding, for example, [as something other than soul,] does occur, it is *based* on the non-discrimination [from soul] of that cause to which there is none antecedent [viz., Nature]; since the non-discrimination of an *effect* [and the 'understanding' is an effect or product of Nature,] is, itself, an effect,[2] [and will, of course, cease, with the cessation of its cause].

---

[1] ननु प्रकृतिपुरुषाविवेक एव चेत्संयोगद्वारा बन्धहेतुस्तयोर्विवेक एव मोक्षहेतुस्तर्हि देहाद्यभिमानसत्त्वेऽपि मोक्षः स्यात्तच्च श्रुतिस्मृतिन्यायविरुद्धमिति । तत्राह ॥

[2] पुरुषे प्रधानाविवेकात्कारणाद्योऽन्याविवेको बुद्ध्याद्यविवेको बुद्ध्याद्यविवेके जाते कार्यावि-

b. The state of the case is this: as, when the soul has been discriminated from the *body*, it is impossible but that it should be discriminated from the *colour* and other [properties], the effects of the body, [which is the substantial cause of its own properties]; so, by parity of reasoning, from the departure of the cause, when soul, in its character of *unalterableness*, &c., has been discriminated from *Nature*, it is impossible that there should remain a conceit of [the soul's being any of] the *products* thereof [i. e., of Nature], such as the 'understanding,' and the like, which have the character of being *modifications*[1] [of primal Nature, while the soul, on the other hand, is a thing unalterable].

c. But then [some one may say], 'What proof is there that there is a conceit [entertained by people in general,] of a *Nature* [or primal principle] different from the conceit of an 'understanding,' &c., [which, you tell us, are products of this supposed first principle]? For all the various conceits [that the soul falls into], such as, 'I am ignorant,' and so on, can be accounted for on the ground simply of an 'understanding,' &c., [without postulating a primal Nature which is to assume the shape of an 'understanding,' &c.]:'

वेकस्य कार्यतयानादिकारणाविवेकमूलकत्वात्तस्य प्रधानाविवेकहाने सत्यवश्यं हानमित्यर्थः ॥

[1] यथा शरीरादात्मनि विविक्ते शरीरकार्येषु रूपादिष्वविवेको न संभवति तथा कूटस्थत्वादिधर्मैः प्रधानात्पुरुषे विविक्ते तत्कार्येषु परिणामादिधर्मकेषु बुद्ध्यादिष्वभिमानो न स्यातुमुत्सहते तुल्यन्यायात्कारणनाशाच्चेति भावः ॥

well, if any one says this, I reply, 'no;' because, unless there were such a thing as Nature, we could not account for such conceits as the following, viz., 'Having died, having died, again, when there is a creation, let me be a denizen of Paradise, and not of hell;' because no *products*, such as the 'understanding,' when they have perished, can be created anew,[1] [any more than [a gold-bracelet, melted down, can be reproduced, though another like it may be produced from the materials].

The soul's confounding itself with Nature is logically antecedent to its confounding itself with anything else.

d. Moreover, it is inadmissible to say that men's conceit of [the identity of themselves with their] 'understanding,' &c., is [the *primary* cause of the soul's bondage, and is] not preceded by anything; because 'understanding' and the rest [as you will not deny] are *effects*. Now, while it is to be expected that there should be some predetermining agency to establish a conceit of [ownership in, or of one's identity with,] any *effects*, it is clear that it is a conceit of [ownership, &c.,] in respect of the *cause*, and nothing else, that must be the predetermining agency: for we see this in ordinary life; and our theories are bound to conform [deferentially] to experience. For [to explain,] we see, in ordinary life, that the conceit of [the ownership of] the grain, &c., pro-

---

[1] ननु बुद्ध्याद्यभिमानातिरिक्ते प्रधानाभिमाने किं प्रमाणमहमज्ञ इत्याद्यखिलाभिमानानां बुद्ध्यादिविषयत्वेनैवोपपत्तेरिति चेन्न मृत्वा मृत्वा पुनः सृष्टौ स्वर्गी स्यां मा च नारकीत्याद्यभिमानानां प्रधानविषयत्वं विनानुपपत्तेरतीतानां बुद्ध्याद्यखिलकार्याणां पुनः सृष्ट्यभावात् ॥

duced by a field, results from the conceit of [the ownership of] the field; and, from the conceit of [the ownership of] gold, the conceit of [the ownership of] the bracelets, or other things, formed of that gold; and, by the removal of these [i. e., the removal of the logically antecedent conceits, that the field, or the gold, is one's property], there is the removal of those,[1] [i. e., the removal of the conceits that the grain, &c, and that the bracelets, &c., the corresponding products or effects of the field and of the gold, are one's property: and so the soul will cease to confound itself with the 'understanding,' when it ceases to confound itself with Nature, of which the 'understanding' is held to be a product].

e. [And, if it be supposed that we thus lay ourselves open to the charge of a *regressus in infinitum*, seeing that, whatever we may assign as the *first* cause, we may, on our own principles, be asked what was the 'predetermining agency' in regard to *it*; or if it be supposed that we are chargeable with reasoning in a circle, when we hold that the soul's confounding itself with Nature is the cause of

---

[1] किं च बुद्ध्यादिषु पुरुषाणामभिमानोऽनादिर्वक्तुं न शक्यते बुद्ध्यादीनां कार्यत्वात्। कार्येष्वभिमानव्यवस्थार्थं नियामकाकाङ्क्षायां कारणाभिमान एव नियामकतया सिद्ध्यति लोके दृष्टत्वात्कल्पनायाश्च दृष्टानुसारित्वात्। दृष्टो हि लोके क्षेत्राभिमानात्क्षेत्रजन्यधान्यादिष्वभिमानः सुवर्णाभिमानात्तज्जन्यकटकादिष्वभिमानस्तयोर्निवृत्त्या च तयोर्निवृत्तिरिति ॥

its *continuing* so to confound itself, and its continuing so to confound itself is, reciprocally, the cause why it confounds itself; we reply, that] there is no occasion to look for any other 'predetermining agency,' in the case of the conceit of [the identity of the soul with] Nature, or in the case of the self-continuance[1] thereof, [i.e., of that error of confounding one's self with Nature]; because [these two are alike] without antecedent, like seed and sprout,[2] [of which it is needless to ask which is the first; the old puzzle, 'which was first, the acorn, or the oak?' being a frivolous question].

f. But then [some one may say], if we admit the soul's bondage [at one time], and its freedom [at another], and its discrimination [at one time], and its non-discrimination [at another], then this is in contradiction to the assertion [in § 19], that it is 'ever essentially a pure and free intelligence;' and it is in contradiction to such texts as this, viz., 'The absolute truth is this, that neither is there destruction [of the soul], nor production [of it]; nor is it bound, nor is it an effecter [of any work], nor is it desirous of liberation, nor is it, indeed, *liberated;* [seeing that that cannot desire or obtain liberation, which was never *bound*].'[3] This [charge of inconsistency] he repels:[4]

---

[1] To render *vásána*, on which see 2, at p. 29, *supra*. *Ed.*

[2] प्रधानाभिमानतद्वासनयोश्च बीजाङ्कुरवदनादित्वान्न तदभिमाने नियामकान्तरापेक्षेति ॥

[3] *Amritabindu Upanishad*, v. 10. See Dr. Albrecht Weber's *Indische Studien*, vol. ii., p. 61, note 2. *Ed.*

[4] ननु पुरुषस्य चेद्बन्धमोक्षौ विवेकाविवेकौ च स्वीकृतौ तर्हि नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तत्वोक्तिविरोधस्तथा

वाङ्मात्रं न तु[1] तत्त्वं चित्तस्थितेः ॥ ५८ ॥

The bondage of the soul is merely verbal.

Aph. 58. It is merely verbal, and not a reality [this so-called bondage of the soul]; since it [the bondage] *resides* in the *mind*, [and not in the soul].

a. That is to say: since bondage, &c., all reside only in the *mind* [and not in the soul], all this, as regards the soul, is merely verbal, i.e., it is *vox et praeterea nihil;* because is is merely a *reflexion,* like the redness of [pellucid] crystal [when a China-rose is near it], but not a reality, with no false imputation, like the redness of the China-rose itself. Hence there is *no* contradiction to what had been said before, [as the objector (under § 57. *f.*) would insinuate]: such is the state of the case.[2]

च न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिर्न बद्धो न च साधकः।
न मुमुक्षुर्न वै मुक्त इत्येषा परमार्थतेत्यादिश्रुति-
विरोधश्चेति तां परिहरति ॥

[1] Aniruddha has, instead of न तु, तु न. Hence: 'But it is merely verbal, not a reality,' &c. *Ed.*

[2] बन्धादीनां सर्वेषां चित्त एवावस्थानात्तत्सर्वं पुरुषे वाङ्मात्रं शब्दमात्रं स्फटिकलौहित्यवत्प्रति-बिम्बमात्रत्वान्न तु तत्त्वमनारोपितं जवालौहित्य-वदित्यर्थः। अतो नोक्तविरोध इति भावः ॥

Whether Testimony, or Inference, without Perception, might not avail to dissipate the soul's bondage.

b. But then, if bondage, &c., as regards the soul, be merely verbal, let them be set aside by *hearing* [that they are merely verbal], or by argument [establishing that they are so]. Why, in the Scripture and the Law, is there enjoined, as the cause of liberation, a discriminative knowledge [of Soul, as distinguished from Non-soul], going the length of *immediate cognition?* To this he replies:[1]

युक्तितोऽपि न बाध्यते दिङ्मूढवदपरोक्षादृते ॥ ५९ ॥

The truth must be directly discerned, and not merely accepted on the ground of Testimony, or of Inference.

Aph. 59. Moreover, it [the non-discrimination of Soul from Nature,] is not to be removed by argument; as that of the person perplexed about the points of the compass [is not to be removed] without immediate cognition.

a. By 'argument' we mean thinking. The word 'moreover' is intended to aggregate [or take in, along with 'argument'] 'testimony,'[2] [or verbal authority, which, no more than 'argument,' or inference, can remove the evil, which can be removed by nothing short of direct intuitive *perception* of the real state of the case].

---

[1] ननु बन्धादिकं चेत्पुरुषे वाङ्मात्रं तर्हि श्रवणेन युक्त्या वा तस्य बाधो भवतु । किमर्थं श्रुतिस्मृत्योः साक्षात्कारपर्यन्तं विवेकज्ञानमुपदिश्यते मोक्षहेतुतयेति । तत्राह ॥

[2] युक्तिर्मननम् । अपिशब्दः श्रवणसमुच्चयार्थः ।

b. That is to say: the bondage, &c., of the soul though [granted to be] merely verbal, are not to be removed by merely hearing, or inferring, without immediate cognition, without directly perceiving; just as the contrariety in regard to the [proper] direction, though merely verbal [as resulting from misdirection], in the case of[1] a person who is mistaken as to the points of the compass [and hence as to his own bearings], is not removed by testimony, or by inference, without immediate cognition, i. e., without [his] directly perceiving[2] [how the points of the compass really lie, to which immediate perception 'testimony,' or 'inference,' may conduce, but the necessity of which these *media*, or instruments of knowledge, cannot supersede].

c. Or it [Aph. 59] may be explained as follows, viz.: But then, [seeing that] it is declared, by the assertion [in Aph. 56], viz., that 'The removal of it is to be effected by the necessary means,' that knowledge, in the shape of discrimination [between Soul and Nature], is the remover of *non*-discrimination [in regard to the matter in question], tell us, is that knowledge of a like nature with the hearing

---

[1] Here I have had to make several insertions and other alterations. Dr. Ballantyne had: 'That is to say, the bondage, &c., [of the soul] is not to be removed by merely hearing, or inferring, without *perceiving;* just as the contrariety in regard to the proper direction, in the case,' &c. *Ed.*

[2] वाङ्मात्रमपि पुरुषस्य बन्धादिकं श्रवणमननमात्रेण न बाध्यतेऽपरोक्षादृते साक्षात्कारं विना यथा दिङ्मूढजनस्य वाङ्मात्रमपि दिग्वैपरीत्यं श्रवणयुक्तिभ्यां न बाध्यते साक्षात्कारं विनेत्यर्थः ॥

[of Testimony], &c.? Or is it something peculiar? A reply to this being looked for, he enounces the aphorism [§ 59]: 'Moreover, it is not to be removed by argument,' &c. That is to say: non-discrimination is not excluded, is not cut off, by argument, or by testimony, unless there be discrimination as an immediate perception; just as is the case with one who is bewildered in regard to [his] direction; because the only thing to remove an *immediate* error is an immediate individual perception[1] [of the truth. For example, a man with the jaundice perceives *white* objects as if they were *yellow*. He may *infer* that the piece of chalk which he looks at is really white; or he may believe the *testimony* of a friend, that it *is* white; but still nothing will remove his erroneous *perception* of yellowness in the chalk, except a direct perception of its whiteness].

d. Having thus, then, set forth the fact that Liberation results from the immediate discrimination [of Soul from

---

[1] अथवेत्थं व्याख्येयं ननु नियतकारणात्तदुच्छित्तिरित्यनेन विवेकज्ञानमविवेकोच्छेदकमुक्तं तज्ज्ञानं किं श्रवणादिसाधारणमुतास्ति कश्चिद्विशेष इत्याकाङ्क्षायामाह युक्तितोऽपीत्यादिसूत्रम्। अविवेको युक्तितः श्रवणतश्च न बाध्यते नोच्छिद्यते विवेकापरोक्ष्यं विना दिङ्मोहवदित्यर्थः साक्षात्कारभ्रमे साक्षात्कारविशेषदर्शनस्यैव विरोधित्वादिति ॥

Nature], the next thing to be set forth is the 'discrimination'[1] [here referred to].

e. This being the topic, in the first place, since only if Soul and Nature exist, liberation can result from the discrimination of the one from the other, therefore that 'instrument of right knowledge' (*pramáṇa*) which establishes the existence of these [two *imperceptible* realities] is [first] to be set forth :[2]

अचाक्षुषाणामनुमानेन बोधो धूमादिभिरिव वह्नेः ॥ ६० ॥

The evidence for things imperceptible.

Aph. 60. The knowledge of things imperceptible is by means of Inference; as that of fire [when not directly perceptible,] is by means of smoke, &c.

a. That is to say: 'of things imperceptible,' i. e., of things not cognizable by the senses, e. g., Nature and the Soul, 'the knowledge,' i. e., the fruit lodged in the soul, is brought about by means of that instrument of right knowledge [which may be called] 'Inference' (*anumána*), [but which (see Nyáya Aphorisms, I., § 5) is, more correctly, 'the recognition of a Sign']; as [the knowledge that there is] fire [in such and such a locality, where we cannot directly

---

[1] तदेवं विवेकसाक्षात्काराम्मोक्षं प्रतिपाद्यातः परं विवेकः प्रतिपादनीयः ॥

[2] तत्रादौ प्रकृतिपुरुषसिद्धौ हि तद्विवेकान्मोक्षः स्यादतस्तत्सिद्धौ प्रमाणमुपन्यस्यते ॥

perceive it,] is brought about by the 'recognition of a Sign,' occasioned by smoke, &c.[1]

b. Moreover, it is to be understood that that which is [true, but yet is] not established by 'Inference,' is established by Revelation. But, since 'Inference' is the chief [among the instruments of knowledge], in this [the Sánkhya] System, 'Inference' only is laid down [in the aphorism,] as the *chief* thing; but Revelation is not disregarded[2] [in the Sánkhya system; as will be seen from Aph. 88 of this Book].

c. He [next] exhibits the order of creation of those things among which Nature is the first, and the relation of cause and effect [among these, severally], preparatorily to the argument that will be [afterwards] stated:[3]

---

[1] अचाक्षुषाणामप्रत्यक्षाणां प्रकृतिपुरुषादीनामनुमानेन प्रमाणेन बोधः पुरुषनिष्ठं फलं सिद्धं भवति यथा धूमादिभिर्जनितेनानुमानेन वह्नेः सिद्धिरित्यर्थः ॥

[2] अनुमानासिद्धमप्यागमात्सिद्ध्यतीत्यपि बोध्यम् । अस्य शास्त्रस्यानुमानप्राधान्यात्तु केवलानुमानस्य मुख्यतयैवोपन्यासो न त्वागमस्यानपेक्षेति ॥

[3] प्रकृत्यादीनां सृष्टिक्रमं वक्ष्यमाणानुमानोपयोगिकार्यकारणभावं च दर्शयति ॥

सत्त्वरजस्तमसां साम्यावस्था प्रकृतिः प्रकृतेर्महा-
न्महतोऽहंकारोऽहंकारात्पञ्च तन्मात्राण्युभयमि-
न्द्रियं तन्मात्रेभ्यः[1] स्थूलभूतानि पुरुष इति पञ्चविं-
शतिर्गणः ॥ ६१ ॥

The twenty-five Realities enumerated.

Aph. 61. Nature (*prakriti*) is the state of equipoise of Goodness (*sattwa*), Passion (*rajas*), and Darkness (*tamas*): from Nature [proceeds] Mind (*mahat*); from Mind, Self-consciousness (*ahankára*); from Self-consciousness, the five Subtile Elements (*tan-mátra*), and both sets [external and internal,] of Organs (*indriya*); and, from the Subtile Elements, the Gross Elements (*sthúla-bhúta*). [Then there is] Soul (*purusha*). Such is the class of twenty-five.

a. 'The state of equipoise' of the [three] things called 'Goodness,' &c., is their being neither less nor more [one than another]; that is to say, the state of *not* being [developed into] an *effect* [in which one or other of them predominates]. And thus 'Nature' is the triad of 'Qualities' (*guṇa*), distinct from the products [to which this triad gives rise]: such is the complete meaning.[2] [3]

b. These things, viz., 'Goodness,' &c., [though spoken of as the three *Qualities*], are not 'Qualities' (*guṇa*) in the *Vaiśeshika* sense of the word; because [the 'Qualities' of

---

[1] My MSS. of Aniruddha omit तन्मात्रेभ्यः. *Ed.*

[2] सत्त्वादिद्रव्याणां या साम्यावस्थान्यूनानतिरिक्तावस्थाकार्यावस्थेत्यर्थः । एवं च कार्यभिन्नं गुणत्रयं प्रकृतिरिति पर्यवसितोऽर्थः ॥

[3] For a translation of a slightly different text, see the *Rational Refutation*, &c., p. 43. *Ed.*

the *Vaiśeshika* system have, themselves, *no* qualities (see Kaṇáda's 16th Aph.); while] *these* have the qualities of Conjunction, Disjunction, Lightness, Force,[1] Weight, &c.[2] In this [Sánkhya] system, and in Scripture, &c., the word 'Quality' (*guṇa*) is employed [as the name of the three things in question],[3] because they are subservient to Soul [and, therefore, hold a secondary rank in the scale of being], and because they form the *cords* [which the word *guṇa* also signifies], viz., 'Mind,' &c., which consist of the three [so-called] 'Qualities,' and which *bind*, as a [cow, or other] brute-beast, the Soul.[4] [5]

c. Of this [Nature] the principle called 'the great one' (*mahat*), viz., the principle of 'Understanding' (*buddhi*), is the product. 'Self-consciousness' is a conceit [of separate personality]. Of this there are two products, (1) the

---

[1] *Balavattwa;* for which I find the variant *chalatwa*, 'mobility.' *Ed.*

[2] Read: 'Goodness and the rest are substances, not specific qualities; for they [themselves] possess [qualities, viz., those of] contact and separation, and also have the properties of levity, mobility, gravity, &c.' *Vaiśeshiká guṇáḣ* is equivalent to the *viśesha-guṇáḣ* in the original of Book V., 25. *a.* For the 'specific qualities,' see the *Bháshá-parichchhеda*, st. 90. *Ed.*

[3] For 'is employed,' &c., read, 'is applied to these (*teshu*), [namely, goodness, passion, and darkness].' *Ed.*

[4] सत्त्वादीनि द्रव्याणि न वैशेषिका गुणाः संयोगविभागवत्त्वाल्लघुत्वबलवत्त्वगुरुत्वादिधर्मकत्वाच्च। तेष्वच्च शास्त्रे श्रुत्यादौ च गुणशब्दः पुरुषोपकरणत्वात्पुरुषपशुबन्धकत्रिगुणात्मकमहदादिरज्जुनिर्मातृत्वाच्च प्रयुज्यते ॥

[5] For a different translation, see the *Rational Refutation*, &c., pp. 43, 44. *Ed.*

'Subtile Elements' and (2) the two sets of 'Organs.' The 'Subtile Elements' are [those of] Sound, Touch, Colour, Taste, and Smell. The two sets of 'Organs,' through their division into the external and the internal, are of eleven kinds. The products of the 'Subtile Elements' are the five 'Gross Elements.' But 'Soul' is something distinct from either product or cause. Such is the class of twenty-five, the aggregate of things. That is to say, besides these there is nothing.[1]

d. He [next], in [several] aphorisms, declares the order of the inferring[2] [of the existence of these principles, the one from the other:

स्थूलात्पञ्चतन्मात्रस्य ॥ ६२ ॥

The existence of the 'Subtile Elements' is inferred from that of the 'Gross.'

Aph. 62. [The knowledge of the existence] of the five 'Subtile Elements' is [by inference,] from the 'Gross Elements.'

---

[1] तस्याः कार्यं महत्तत्त्वं बुद्धितत्त्वम्। अहंकारोऽभिमानः। तस्य कार्यद्वयं तन्मात्राण्युभयमिन्द्रियं च। तन्मात्राणि शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धाः। उभयमिन्द्रियं बाह्याभ्यन्तरभेदेनैकादशविधम्। तन्मात्राणां कार्याणि पञ्च स्थूलभूतानि। पुरुषस्तु कार्यकारणविलक्षण इति। इत्येवं पञ्चविंशतिगणः पदार्थव्यूहः। एतदतिरिक्तः पदार्थो नास्तीत्यर्थः ॥

[2] अनुमानक्रममाह सूत्रैः ॥

a. 'The knowledge, by inference,' so much is supplied,[1] [to complete the aphorism, from Aph. 60].

b. Earth, &c., the 'Gross Elements,' are proved to exist, by Perception; [and] thereby [i. e., from that Perception; for Perception must precede Inference, as stated in Gotama's 5th Aphorism,] are the 'Subtile Elements' inferred, [the *στοιχεῖα στοιχείων* of Empedocles]. And so the application [of the process of inference to the case] is as follows:

(1) The Gross Elements, or those which have not reached the absolute limit [of simplification, or of the atomic], consist of things [Subtile Elements, or Atoms,] which have distinct qualities; [the earthy element having the distinctive quality of Odour; and so of the others]:

(2) Because they are gross;

(3) [And everything that is gross is formed of something less gross, or, in other words, more subtile,] as jars, webs, &c.;[2] [the gross web being formed of the less gross threads; and so of the others].

बाह्याभ्यन्तराभ्यां तैश्चाहंकारस्य[3] ॥ ६३ ॥

And thence that of Self-consciousness.

Aph. 63. [The knowledge of the existence] of Self-consciousness is [by inference,] from the external and inter-

---

[1] अनुमानेन बोध इत्यनुवर्तते ॥

[2] स्थूलं पृथिव्यादि प्रत्यक्षसिद्धं तेन तन्मात्राणामनुमानम् । तथा चापकर्षकाष्ठापन्नानि स्थूलभूतानि सविशेषगुणवद्द्रव्योपादानकानि स्थूलत्वाद्घटपटादिवदिति प्रयोगः ॥

[3] In my MSS. of Aniruddha there is no च after तैः. *Ed.*

nal [organs], and from these ['Subtile Elements,' mentioned in Aph. 62].

a. By inference from [the existence of] the external and internal organs, and from [that of] these 'Subtile Elements,' there is the knowledge of [the existence of such a principle as] Self-consciousness.[1]

b. The application [of the process of inference to the case] is in the following [somewhat circular] manner:

(1) The Subtile Elements and the Organs are made up of things consisting of Self-consciousness:

(2) Because they are products of Self-consciousness:

(3) Whatever is not so [i. e., whatever is *not* made out of Self-consciousness] is not thus [i. e., is not a *product* of Self-consciousness]; as the Soul, [which, not being made up thereof, is not a product of it].[2]

c. But then, if it be thus [i. e., if it be, as the Sánkhyas declare, that all objects, such as jars, are made up of Self-consciousness, while Self-consciousness depends on 'Understanding,' or 'Intellect,' or 'Mind,' the *first* product of 'Nature' (see Aph. 61)], then [some may object, that], since it would be the case that the Self-consciousness of the potter is the material of the jar, the jar made by him would disappear, on the beatification of the potter, whose internal organ [or 'Understanding'] then surceases.

---

[1] बाह्याभ्यन्तराभ्यामिन्द्रियाभ्यां तैस्तन्मात्रैश्चाहंकारस्यानुमानेन बोधः ॥

[2] तन्मात्रेन्द्रियाण्यभिमानवद्द्रव्योपादानकान्यभिमानकार्यद्रव्यत्वात् । यन्नैवं तन्नैवं यथा पुरुष इति प्रयोगः ॥

And this [the objector may go on to say,] is not the case; because *another* man [*after* the beatification of the potter,] recognizes that 'This is that same jar[1] [which, you may remember, was fabricated by our deceased acquaintance].'

d. [In reply to this we say,] it is *not* thus; because, on one's beatification, there is an end of only those modifications of his internal organ [or 'Intellect'] which could be causes [as the *jar* no longer can be,] of the emancipated soul's *experiencing* [either good or ill], but not an end of the modifications of intellect in general, nor [an end] of intellect altogether:[2] [so that we might spare ourselves the trouble of further argument, so far as concerns the objection grounded on the assumption that the intellect of the potter *surceases*, on his beatification: but we may go further, and admit, for the sake of argument, the surcease of the 'intellect' of the beatified potter, without conceding any necessity for the surcease of his pottery. This alternative theory of the case may be stated as follows]:

e. Or [as Berkeley suggests, in his Principles of Human knowledge, Ch. vi.], let the Self-consciousness of the *Deity* be the cause why jars and the like [continue to exist], and

---

[1] नन्वेवं कुलालाहंकारस्यापि घटोपादानत्वापत्त्या कुलालमुक्तौ तदन्तःकरणनाशे तन्निर्मितघटनाशः स्यात्। न चैतद्युक्तं पुरुषान्तरेण स एवायं घट इति प्रत्यभिज्ञायमानत्वादिति ॥

[2] नैवं मुक्तपुरुषभोगहेतुपरिणामस्यैव तदन्तःकरणे मोक्षोत्तरमुच्छेदान्न तु परिणामसामान्यस्यान्तःकरणस्वरूपस्य वोच्छेदः ॥

not the Self-consciousness of the potter, &c.,[1] [who may lose their Self-consciousness, whereas the Deity, the sum of all life, *Hiraṇyagarbha* (see *Vedánta-śara*, § 62), never loses *his* Self-consciousness, while aught living continues].

तेनान्तःकरणस्य ॥ ६४ ॥

And thence that of Intellect.

Aph. 64. [The knowledge of the existence] of Intellect is [by inference,] from that [Self-consciousness, § 63].

a. That is to say: by inference from [the existence of] 'that,' viz., Self-consciousness, which is a product, there comes the knowledge of 'Intellect' (*buddhi*), the *great* 'inner organ' (*antaḥkaraṇa*), [hence] called 'the great one' (*mahat*), [the existence of which is recognized] under the character of the *cause* of this[2] [product, viz., Self-consciousness].

b. And so the application [again rather circular, of the process of inference to the case,] is as follows:

(1) The thing called Self-consciousness is made out of the things that consist of the moods of judgment [or mind];

(2) Because it is a thing which is a product of judgment [proceeding in the Cartesian order of *cogito, ergo sum;* and]

---

[1] अथवा घटादिष्वपि हिरण्यगर्भाहंकार एव कारणमस्तु न कुलालाद्यहंकारः ॥

[2] तेनाहंकारेण कार्येण तत्कारणतया मुख्यस्यान्तःकरणस्य महदाख्यस्य बुद्धेरनुमानेन बोध इत्यर्थः ॥

(3) Whatever is not so [i. e., whatever is *not* made out of judgment, or mental assurance], is not thus [i. e., is not a product of mental assurance]; as the Soul, [which is not made out of this or of anything antecedent], &c.[1]

c. Here the following reasoning is to be understood: Every one, having first determined anything under a concept [i. e., under such a form of thought as is expressed by a general term; for example, that this which presents itself is a jar, or a human body, or a possible action of one kind or other], after that makes the judgment, 'This is I,' or 'This ought to be done by me,' and so forth: so much is quite settled; [and there is no dispute that the fact is as here stated]. Now, having, in the present instance, to look for some *cause* of the thing called 'Self-consciousness' [which manifests itself in the various judgments just referred to], since the relation of cause and effect subsists between the two functions [the occasional conception, and the subsequent occasional judgment, which is a function of Self-consciousness], it is assumed, for simplicity, merely that the relation of cause and effect exists between the two substrata to which the [two sets of] functions belong; [and this is sufficient,] because it follows, as a matter of course, that the occurrence of a *function* of the effect must result from the occurrence of a *function* of the cause;[2] [nothing, according to the Sánkhya, being in any

---

[1] तथा चायं प्रयोगः । अहंकारद्रव्यं निश्चयवृत्तिमद्द्रव्योपादानकं निश्चयकार्यद्रव्यत्वात् । यन्नैवं तन्नैवं यथा पुरुषादिरिति ॥

[2] अत्रायं तर्को बोध्यः । सर्वोऽपि लोकः पदार्थमादौ स्वरूपतो निश्चित्य पश्चादभिमन्यतेऽयमहं

product, except so far, and in such wise, as it preexisted in the cause of that product].

ततः प्रकृतेः ॥ ६५ ॥

And thence that of Nature.

Aph. 65. [The knowledge of the existence] of Nature is [by inference,] from that ['Intellect,' § 64].

a. By inference from [the existence of] 'that,' viz., the principle [of Intellect, termed], 'the Great one,' which is a *product*, there comes the knowledge of [the existence of] Nature, as [its] cause.[1]

b. The application [of the process of inference to the case] is as follows:

(1) Intellect, the affections whereof are Pleasure, Pain, and Dulness, is produced from something which has these affections, [those of] Pleasure, Pain, and Dulness:

(2) Because, whilst it is a *product* [and must, therefore, have arisen from something consisting of that which itself now consists of], it consists of Pleasure, Pain, and Dulness; [and]

मयेदं कर्तव्यमित्यादिरूपेणेति तावत्सिद्धमेव। तत्राहंकारद्रव्यकारणाकाङ्क्षायां वृत्त्योः कार्यकारणभावेन तदाश्रययोरेव कार्यकारणभावो लाघवात्कल्पते कारणस्य वृत्तिलाभेन कार्यवृत्तिलाभस्यौत्सर्गिकत्वादिति ॥

[1] ततो महत्तत्त्वात्कार्यात्कारणतया प्रकृतेरनुमानेन बोधः ॥

(3) [Every *product* that has the affections of, or that occasions, Pleasure, Pain, or Dulness, takes its rise in something which consists of these]; as lovely women, &c.[1]

c. For an agreeable woman gives pleasure to her husband, and, therefore, [is known to be mainly made up of, or] partakes of the quality of 'Goodness;' the indiscreet one gives pain to him, and, therefore, partakes of the quality of 'Foulness;' and she who is separated [and perhaps forgotten,] occasions indifference, and so partakes of the quality of 'Darkness.'[2]

d. And the appropriate refutation [of any objection], in this case, is [the principle], that it is fitting that the qualities of the effect should be [in every case,] in conformity with the qualities of the cause.[3]

e Now he states how, in a different way, we have [the evidence of] inference for [the existence of] Soul, which is void of the relation of cause and effect that has been men-

---

[1] अयं प्रयोगः। सुखदुःखमोहधर्मिणी बुद्धिः सुखदुःखमोहधर्मकद्रव्यजन्या कार्यत्वे सति सुखदुःखमोहात्मकत्वात्कान्तादिवदिति॥

[2] कान्ता हि भर्तुः सुखदेति सात्त्विकी। अविनया दुःखदेति राजसी। विरहिणी मोहदेति तामसी भवति॥

[3] कारणानुसारेणैव कार्यगुणौचित्यं चात्रानुकूलस्तर्कः॥

tioned,[1] [in the four preceding aphorisms, as existing between Nature and its various products]:

संहतपरार्थत्वात्पुरुषस्य ॥ ६६ ॥

The argument for the existence of Soul.

Aph. 66. [The existence] of Soul [is inferred] from the fact that the combination [of the principles of Nature into their various effects] is for the sake of another [than unintelligent Nature, or any of its similarly unintelligent products].

a. 'Combination,' i. e., conjunction, which is the cause [of all products; these resulting from the conjunction of their constituent parts]. Since whatever has this quality, as Nature,[2] Mind, and so on [unlike Soul, which is *not* made up of parts], is for the sake of some other; for this reason it is understood that Soul exists: such is the remainder,[3] [required to complete the aphorism].

b. But the application [of the argument, in this particular case, is as follows]:

(1) The thing in question, viz., Nature the 'Great one,' with the rest [of the aggregate of the unintelligent], has, as its fruit [or end], the [mundane] experiences and the [eventual] Liberation of some other than itself:

---

[1] अथ यथोक्तकार्यकारणभावशून्यस्य पुरुषस्य प्रकारान्तरेणानुमानमाह ॥

[2] Here indicated by the adjective *avyakta*, 'the indiscrete.' See Aph. 136 of this Book. *Ed.*

[3] संहतः कारणीभूतसंयोगः । तद्वतोऽव्यक्तमहदादेः परार्थत्वाद्धेतोः पुरुषस्य बोध इति शेषः ॥

(2) Because it is a combination [or *compages*];

(3) [And every combination,] as a couch, or a seat, or the like, [is for another's use, not for its own; and its several component parts render no mutual service].[1]

c. Now, in order to establish that it is the cause of all [products], he establishes the *eternity* of Nature (*prakṛiti*):[2]

मूले मूलाभावादमूलं मूलम्[3] ॥ ६७ ॥

Argument for the eternity of Nature.

Aph. 67. Since the root has no root, the root [of all] is rootless.

a. Since 'the root' *(múla)*, i.e., the cause of the twenty-three principles, [which, with Soul and the root itself, make up the twenty-five realities recognized in the Sánkhya,] 'has no root,' i.e., has no cause, the 'root,' viz., Nature *(pradhána)*, is 'rootless,' i.e., void of root. That is to say, there is no other cause of Nature; because there would be

---

[1] प्रयोगस्तु विवादास्पदं प्रकृतिमहदादिकं स्वेतरस्य भोगापवर्गफलकं संहतत्वाच्छय्यासनादिवदिति ॥

[2] इदानीं सर्वकारणत्वोपपत्तये प्रकृतेर्नित्यत्वमुपपादयति ॥

[3] This seems to mean: 'There being no root to a root, the root [or radical principle, in the Sánkhya,] is rootless.'

In several MSS. which I consulted in India I found the strange reading: मूलं मूलाभावादमूलं मूलानाम् । 'The root of roots, since it has no root, is rootless.' This is very like saying that A=A. *Ed.*

a *regressus in infinitum*,[1] [if we were to suppose another cause, which, by parity of reasoning, would require another cause; and so on without end].

b. He states the argument [just mentioned] in regard to this, [as follows]:[2]

पारम्पर्येऽप्येकत्र परिनिष्ठेति संज्ञामात्रम् ॥ ६८ ॥

---

[1] मूले त्रयोविंशतितत्त्वानां कारणे मूलाभावात्कारणाभावान्मूलं प्रधानममूलं मूलशून्यम् । अनवस्थापत्त्या प्रधानस्य न कारणान्तरमस्तीत्यर्थः ॥

The source of the preceding exposition I have not ascertained. Vijnána has: त्रयोविंशतितत्त्वानां मूलमुपादानं प्रधानं मूलशून्यमनवस्थापत्त्या तत्र मूलान्तरासंभवादित्यर्थः । Nágeśa: मूलं सर्वेषामुपादानं प्रधानं मूलशून्यमनवस्थापत्त्या मूलभूते तत्र मूलान्तरासंभवादित्यर्थः । Aniruddha: मूलप्रकृतेर्मूलाभावात्कारणाभावादमूलं यत्कारणं तन्मूलम् । सा प्रकृतिः । Vedánti Mahádeva: त्रयोविंशतितत्त्वानां मूले प्रधानेऽनवस्थापत्त्या कारणाभावादकारणं प्रधानमित्यर्थः । *Ed.*

[2] अत्र युक्तिमाह ॥

The employment of the term Primal Agency, or Nature, is merely to debar the regressus in infinitum

Aph. 68. Even if there be a succession, there is a halt at some *one* point; and so it is merely a name [that we give to the point in question, when we speak of the *root* of things, under the the name of 'Nature'].

a. Since there would be the fault of *regressus in infinitum,* if there were a succession of causes,—another cause of Nature, and another [cause] of that one, again,—there must be, at last, a halt, or conclusion, at some one point, somewhere or other, at some one, uncaused, eternal thing. Therefore, that at which we stop is the *Primal Agency (pra-kriti)*; for this [word *prakriti,* usually and conveniently rendered by the term *Nature,*] is nothing more than a sign to denote the cause which is the *root:* such is the meaning.[1]

b. But then [some Vedántí may object, according to this view of matters], the position that there are just twenty-five realities is not made out; for, in addition to[2] the 'Indiscrete' [or primal Nature], which [according to you,] is the cause of Mind,[3] *another* unintelligent principle, named 'Ignorance' [see *Vedánta-sára,* § 21], presents

[1] प्रकृतेरन्यत्कारणं तस्याप्यन्यदिति कारणपारम्पर्येऽप्यनवस्थादोषादन्ततोऽकारण एकस्मिन्नेकस्मिन्यत्र कुत्रचिन्नित्ये परिनिष्ठा पर्यवसानं भविष्यतीति। अतो यत्र पर्यवसानं सैव प्रकृतिरिति हि मूलकारणस्य संज्ञामात्रमित्यर्थः॥

[2] Read 'in connexion with.' *Ed.*

[3] Literally, instead of 'Mind,' 'the principle [termed] the Great one.' *Ed.*

itself. Having pondered this doubt, he declares [as follows]:[1]

समानः प्रकृतेर्द्वयोः ॥ ६९ ॥

Nature and Soul alike uncreated.

Aph. 69. Alike, in respect of Nature, and of both [Soul and Nature, is the argument for the uncreated existence].[2]

a. In the discussion of the Primal Agent [Nature], the cause which is the root [of all products], the same side is taken by us both, the asserter [of the Sánkhya doctrine] and the opponent [Vedántí]. This may be thus stated: As there is mention, in Scripture, of the *production* of Nature, so, too, is there of that of *Ignorance*, in such texts as this, viz.: 'This Ignorance, which has five divisions, was produced from the great Spirit.' Hence it must needs be that a figurative production is intended to be asserted, in respect of *one* of these [and not the *literal* production of both; else we should have no root at all]; and, of the two, it is with *Nature* only that a figurative production, in the shape of a manifestation through conjunction with Soul, &c., is congruous. A production [such as that metaphorical one here spoken of,] the characteristic of which is conjunction *is* mentioned; for there is mention

---

[1] ननु पञ्चविंशतितत्त्वानीति नोपपद्यते महत्तत्त्वकारणाव्यक्तापेक्षयाविद्याख्यजडतत्त्वान्तरापत्तेरित्याशङ्क्याह ॥

[2] This is Dr. Ballantyne's revised translation, suggested by a remark of Vijnána, quoted and translated below, in *b*. The rendering now replaced runs: 'Alike [is the opinion] of both [of us], in respect of Nature.' The side-note was formerly correspondent to *a*., viz.: 'He meets a Vedántic objection.' *Ed.*

of [such] a figurative origination of Soul and Nature, in a passage of the *Kaurma* [*Puráṇa*], beginning, 'Of action [or the Primal Agency], and knowledge [or Soul],' and so on. And, as there is no mention, in Scripture, of the origin of *Ignorance*, as figurative, *it* is *not* from eternity. And Ignorance, which consists of false knowledge, has been declared, in an aphorism of the *Yoga*, to be [not a separate entity, but] 'an affection of the mind.' Hence there is no increase to the [list of the twenty-five] Realities,[1] [in the shape of a twenty-sixth principle, to be styled Ignorance].

b. Or [according to another, and more probable, inter-

---

[1] प्रकृतेर्मूलकारणविचारे द्वयोर्वादिप्रतिवादिनोरावयोः समानः पक्षः। एतदुक्तं भवति यथा प्रकृतेरुत्पत्तिः श्रूयत एवमविद्याया अपि। अविद्या पञ्चपर्वैषा प्रादुर्भूता महात्मन इत्यादिवाक्यैः। अत एकस्या अवश्यं गौण्युत्पत्तिर्वक्तव्या तत्र च प्रकृतेरेव पुरुषसंयोगादिभिरभिव्यक्तिरूपा गौण्युत्पत्तिर्युक्ता। संयोगलक्षणोत्पत्तिः कथ्यते कर्मज्ञानयोरिति कौर्मवाक्ये प्रकृतिपुरुषयोर्गौणोत्पत्तिस्मरणात्। अविद्यायाश्च क्वापि गौणोत्पत्त्यश्रवणात्तस्या अनादिता। अविद्या च मिथ्याज्ञानरूपा बुद्धिधर्म इति योगे सूचितम्। अतो न तत्त्वाधिक्यम्॥

pretation of the aphorism,] the meaning is this, that the argument is the same in support of both, i.e., of both Soul and Nature: such is the meaning.[1]

c. But then, there being [as has been shown,] a mode of arriving, by inference, at [a knowledge of the saving truth in regard to] Nature, Soul, &c., whence is it that reflexion, in the shape of discrimination [between Soul and Nature], does not take place in the case of *all* [men]? In regard to this point, he states [as follows]:[2]

अधिकारित्रैविध्यान्न नियमः ॥ ७० ॥

All do not profit by the saving truth; because it is only the best kind of people that are fully amenable to reason.

Aph. 70. There is no rule [or necessity, that *all* should arrive at the truth]; because those who are privileged [to engage in the inquiry] are of three descriptions.

a. For those privileged [to engage in the inquiry] are of three descriptions, through their distinction into those who, in reflecting, are dull, mediocre, and best. Of these, by the dull the [Sánkhya] arguments are frustrated [and altogether set aside], by means of the sophisms that have been uttered by the *Bauddhas*, &c. By the mediocre they [are brought into doubt, or, in other words,] are made to appear as if there were equally strong arguments on the other side, by means of arguments which really prove the reverse [of what these people employ them to prove], or by

---

[1] अथ वा द्वयोः प्रकृतिपुरुषयोः समान एव न्याय इत्यर्थः ॥

[2] ननु प्रकृतिपुरुषाद्यनुमानप्रकारसत्त्वे सर्वेषां विवेकमननं कुतो न जायते । तत्राह ॥

arguments which are not true: [see the section on Fallacies in the *Tarka-sangraha*]. But it is only the *best* of those privileged, that reflect in the manner that has been set forth [in our exposition of the process of reflexion which leads to the discriminating of Soul from Nature]: such is the import. But there is no rule that *all* must needs reflect in the manner so set forth: such is the literal meaning.[1]

b. He now, through two aphorisms, defines 'the Great one' and 'Self-consciousness';[2] [the reader being presumed to remember that Nature consists of the three 'Qualities' in equipoise, and to be familiar with the other principles, such as the 'Subtile elements' (see § 61)]:

महदाख्यमाद्यं कार्यं तन्मनः ॥ ७१ ॥

By 'the Great one' is meant Mind.

Aph. 71. The first product [of the Primal Agent, Nature], which is called 'the Great one,' is Mind.

a. 'Mind' (*manas*). 'Mind' [is so called], because its function is 'thinking' (*manana*). By 'thinking' is here meant 'judging' (*niśchaya*). That of which this is the func-

---

[1] मननं हि मन्दमध्यमोत्तमभेदेन त्रिविधा अधिकारिणः। तत्र मन्दैर्बौद्धाद्युक्तकुतर्कैरनुमानानि बाध्यन्ते। मध्यमैर्विरुद्धासल्लिङ्गैः सत्प्रतिपक्षितानि क्रियन्ते। उत्तमाधिकारिणामेव तूक्तरीत्या मननमिति भावः। सर्वेषामेव तूक्तरीत्या मनननियमो नेत्यक्षरार्थः॥

[2] महदहंकारयोः स्वरूपमाह सूत्राभ्याम्॥

tion is 'intellect' (*buddhi*); and *that* is the first product, that called 'the Great one' (*mahat*): such is the meaning.[1]

चरमोऽहंकारः ॥ ७२ ॥

The relation of Self-consciousness to Mind.

Aph. 72. 'Self-consciousness' is that which is subsequent [to Mind.]

a. 'Self-consciousness,' the function of which is a conceit [that '*I* exist,' '*I* do this, that, and the other thing'], is that which is subsequent: that is to say, 'Self-consciousness' is the next after 'the Great one'[2] [§ 71].

b. Since 'Self-consciousness' is that whose function is a conceit [which brings out the *Ego*, in every case of cognition, the matter of which cognition would, else, have lain dormant in the bosom of Nature, the formless Objective], it therefore follows that the others [among the phenomena of mundane existence,] are effects of this [Self-consciousness]; and so he declares [as follows]:[3]

---

[1] मन इति। मननवृत्तिकं मनः। मननमत्र निश्चयः। तद्वृत्तिका बुद्धिः। तन्महदाख्यमाद्यं कार्यमित्यर्थः॥

[2] अहंकारोऽभिमानवृत्तिकः पदार्थश्चरमो महतोऽनन्तरोऽहंकार इत्यर्थः।

[3] यतोऽभिमानवृत्तिकोऽहंकारोऽतस्तत्कार्यत्वमुत्तरेषामुपपन्नमित्याह॥

तत्कार्यत्वमुत्तरेषाम्[1] ॥ ७३ ॥

All products, save Mind, result from Self-consciousness

Aph. 73. To the others it belongs to be products thereof, [i.e., of Self-consciousness].

a. 'To be products thereof,' i.e., to be products of Self-consciousness: that is to say, the fact of being products thereof belongs to the others,[2] the eleven 'Organs' (*indriya*), the five 'Subtile elements,' and, mediately, to the [gross] Elements, also, the products of the Subtile elements.[3]

b. But then, if it be thus [some one may say], you relinquish your dogma, that *Nature* is the cause of the whole world. Therefore he declares [as follows]:[4]

आद्यहेतुता तद्द्वारा पारम्पर्येऽप्यणुवत् ॥ ७४ ॥

---

[1] Instead of उत्तरेषां, which seems to be peculiar to Vijnána, Aniruddha and others have the preferable lection अन्येषां. *Ed.*

[2] To render अन्येषां. Paragraph *a* is taken, with slight alterations at the beginning and at the end, from Aniruddha. *Ed.*

[3] तत्कार्यत्वमहंकारकार्यत्वमन्येषामेकादशेन्द्रियाणां पञ्च तन्मात्राणां पारम्पर्येण तन्मात्रकार्याणामपि भूतानां तत्कार्यत्वमित्यर्थः ॥

[4] ननु यद्येवं तर्हि प्रधानं सर्वजगत्कारणमिति सिद्धान्तहानिरत आह ॥

Nature, immediately the cause of Mind, is, mediately, the cause of all other products.

Aph. 74. Moreover, mediately, through that [i.e., the 'Great one' (§71)], the first [cause, viz., Nature,] is the cause [of all products]; as is the case with the Atoms, [the causes, though not the immediate causes, of jars, &c.].

a. 'Moreover, mediately,' i.e., moreover, not in the character of the immediate cause, 'the first,' i.e., Nature, *is* the cause of 'Self-consciousness' and the rest, [mediately,] through 'the Great one' and the rest; as, in the theory of the *Vaiśeshikas,* the Atoms are the cause of a jar, or the like, only [mediately,] through combinations of two atoms, and so on: such is the meaning.[1]

b. But then, since, also, both Nature and Soul are eternal, which of them is [really] the cause of the creation's commencing? In regard to this, he declares [as follows]:[2]

पूर्वभावित्वे द्वयोरेकतरस्य हानेऽन्यतरयोगः[3] ॥७५॥

---

[1] पारम्पर्येऽपि साक्षादहेतुत्वेऽप्याद्यायाः प्रकृतेर्हेतुताहंकारादिषु महदादिद्वारास्ति यथा वैशेषिकमतेऽणूनां घटादिहेतुता द्व्यणुकादिद्वारैवेत्यर्थः ॥

[2] ननु प्रकृतिपुरुषयोर्द्वयोरपि नित्यत्वात्सृष्ट्यादौ कस्य कारणत्वमित्यत आह ॥

[3] Slightly better, perhaps, than this reading is that of Aniruddha: पूर्वभावित्वे द्वयोरेकतरहानेनान्यतरयोगः। Aniruddha's explanation here follows: न पूर्वभावित्वमात्रेण कारणत्वं किं त्वन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां द्वयोर्मध्य एकस्य

Why Nature is the sole cause.

Aph. 75. While both [Soul and Nature] are antecedent [to all products], since the one [viz., Soul,] is devoid [of this character of being a cause], it is applicable [only] to the other of the two, [viz., Nature].

a. That is to say: 'while both,' viz., Soul and Nature, are preexistent to every product, still, 'since the one,' viz., Soul, from the fact of its not being modified [into anything else, as clay is modified into a jar], must be 'devoid,' or lack the nature of a cause, 'it is applicable,' i.e., the nature of a cause must belong, to the *other* of the two.[1]

b. But then [some one may say], let *Atoms* alone be causes; since there is no dispute [that *these* are causal]. In reply to this, he says:[2]

परिच्छिन्नं न[3] सर्वोपादानम् ॥ ७६ ॥

पुरुषस्य कारणत्वयोग्यताहानिरविकारित्वश्रुतेः। अतोऽन्यतरस्य प्रधानस्य कारणत्वयोगः। *Ed.*

[1] द्वयोरेव पुंप्रकृत्योरखिलकार्यपूर्वभावित्वेऽप्येकतरस्य पुरुषस्यापरिणामित्वेन हाने कारणताहान्यामन्यतरस्य योगः कारणतासंभव इत्यर्थः ॥

[2] नन्वविवादात्परमाणूनामेव कारणत्वमस्त्वित्यत आह ॥

[3] Aniruddha has, according to both my MSS., परिच्छिन्नत्वान्न. *Ed.*

Why the theory of a plastic Nature is preferable to that of Atoms.

Aph. 76. What is limited cannot be the substance of all [things].

a. That which is limited cannot be the substance of all [things]; as yarn cannot be the [material] cause of a jar. Therefore it would [on the theory suggested,] be necessary to mention separate causes of [all] things severally; and it is simpler to assume a single cause. Therefore Nature alone is the cause. Such is the meaning.[1]

b. He alleges Scripture in support of this:[2]

तदुत्पत्तिश्रुतेश्च ॥ ७७ ॥

Scripture declares in favour of the theory.

Aph. 77. And [the proposition that Nature is the cause of all is proved] from the text of Scripture, that the origin [of the world] is therefrom, [i.e., from Nature].

a. An argument, in the first instance, has been set forth [in § 76; for, till argument fails him, no one falls back upon authority]. Scripture, moreover, declares that Nature is the cause of the world, in such terms as, 'From Nature the world arises,' &c.[3]

---

[1] यत्परिच्छिन्नं न तत्सर्वोपादानं यथा न तन्तुर्घटस्य कारणम्। तस्मात्पदार्थानां पृथक्पृथक्कारणं वक्तव्यमेककारणत्वे च लाघवम्। तस्मात्प्रधानस्यैव कारणत्वमित्यर्थः॥

[2] अत्र श्रुतिं दर्शयति॥

[3] युक्तिस्तावत्प्रोक्ता। श्रुतिरपि प्रधानस्य जगत्कारणतामाह प्रधानाज्जगज्जायत इति॥

b. But then [some one may say], a jar which antecedently did not exist is seen to come into existence. Let, then, *antecedent non-existence* be the cause [of each product]; since this is an invariable antecedent, [and, hence, a cause; 'the invariable antecedent being denominated a cause,' if Dr. Brown, in his 6th lecture, is to be trusted]. To this he replies:[1]

नावस्तुनो वस्तुसिद्धिः ॥ ७८ ॥

Ex nihilo nihil fit.

Aph. 78. A thing is not made out of nothing.

a. That is to say: it is not possible that out of nothing, i.e., out of a nonentity, a thing should be made, i.e., an entity should arise. If an entity were to arise out of a nonentity, then, since the character of a cause is visible in its product, the *world*, also, would be unreal: such is the meaning.[2]

b. Let the world, too, *be* unreal: what harm is that to *us?* [If any ask this,] he, therefore, declares [as follows]:[3]

अबाधाददुष्टकारणजन्यत्वाच्च नावस्तुत्वम् ॥ ७९ ॥

---

[1] ननु प्रागसतो घटस्य भवनं दृश्यते । नियतपूर्वभावित्वात्प्रागभावः कारणमस्त्वित्यत आह ॥

[2] अवस्तुनोऽभावाद्वस्तुसिद्धिर्भावोत्पत्तिर्न संभवतीत्यर्थः । यद्यभावाद्भावोत्पत्तिस्तर्हि कारणरूपं कार्ये दृश्यत इति जगतोऽप्यवस्तुत्वं स्यादित्यर्थः ॥

[3] भवतु जगदप्यवस्तु का नो हानिरित्यत आह ॥

Reasons why the world is not to be supposed unreal.

Aph. 79. It [the world] is not unreal; because there is no fact contradictory [to its reality], and because it is not the [false] result of depraved causes, [leading to a belief in what ought not to be believed].

a. When there is the notion, in regard to a shell [of a pearl-oyster, which sometimes glitters like silver], that it is silver, its being silver is contradicted by the [subsequent and more correct] cognition, that this is *not* silver. But, in the case in question [that of the world regarded as a reality], no one ever has the cognition, 'This world is *not* in the shape of an entity,' by which [cognition, if any one ever really had such,] its being an entity might be opposed.[1]

b. And it is held that that is false which is the result of a *depraved* cause; e.g., some one's cognition of a [white] conch-shell as *yellow*, through such a fault as the jaundice, [which depraves his eye-sight]. But, in the case in question, [that of the world regarded as a reality], there is no such [temporary or occasional] depravation [of the senses]; because all, at all times, cognize the world as a reality. Therefore the world is *not* an unreality.[2]

---

[1] शुक्तौ रजतमिति ज्ञाने नेदं रजतमिति ज्ञानाद्रजतबाधः । न चात्र नेदं भावरूपं जगदिति कस्यापि ज्ञानं येन भावरूपबाधः स्यात् ॥

[2] दुष्टकारणजन्यत्वाच्च मिथ्येत्यवगम्यते यथा कामलादिदोषात्पीतशङ्खज्ञानं कस्यचित् । अत्र च जगज्ज्ञानस्य सर्वेषां सर्वदा सत्त्वान्न दोषोऽस्ति । तस्मान्नावस्तु जगदिति ॥

c. But then [some one may suggest], *let* a nonentity be the [substantial] cause of the world; still the world will not [necessarily, therefore,] be unreal. In regard to this, he declares [as follows]:[1]

भावे तद्योगेन तत्सिद्धिरभावे तदभावात्कुतस्तरां तत्सिद्धिः ॥ ८० ॥

The product of something is something; and that of nothing, nothing.

Aph. 80. If it [the substantial cause,] be an entity, then this would be the case, [that the product would be an entity], from its union [or identity] therewith; [but] if [the cause be] a nonentity, then how could it possibly be the case [that the product would be real], since *it* is a nonentity, [like the cause with which it is united, in the relation of identity]?

a. If an *entity* were the substantial cause [of the world], then, since [it is a maxim that] the qualities of the cause present themselves in the product, 'this would be the case,' i.e., it would be the case that the product was real, 'because of union therewith,' i.e., because of the union [of the product] with the reality [which is its substratum]. [But,] since, [by parity of reasoning], if a *nonentity* [were the substantial cause], the world would be a nonentity, then, by reason of its being a nonentity, i.e., by reason of the world's being [on that supposition,] necessarily a nonentity, [like its supposed cause], how could this be the case,[2] [that it would be *real*]?

---

[1] नन्वभावः कारणमस्तु तथाप्यभावत्वं न जगतो भविष्यतीति । तत्राह ॥

[2] भाव उपादानकारणे कारणगुणाः कार्ये इति

b. But then [a follower of the *Mímáṅsá* may say], since [it would appear that] nonentity can take no shape but that of nonentity, let *works* alone be the cause of the world. What need have we of the hypothesis of 'Nature'? To this he replies:[1]

न कर्मण उपादानायोगात्[2] ॥ ८१ ॥

Action cannot serve as a substratum.

Aph. 81. No; for *works* are not adapted to be the *substantial* cause [of any product].

a. Granting that 'the unseen' [merit or demerit arising from actions] may be an *instrumental* cause, [in bringing about the mundane condition of the agent], yet we never see merit or demerit in the character of the *substantial* cause [of any product]: and our theories ought to show deference to our experience. 'Nature' is to be accepted; because Liberation arises [see § 56,[3] and § 83,] from discerning the distinction between Nature and the Soul.[4]

तद्योगेन भावयोगेन तत्सिद्धिः कार्यस्य वस्तुत्वसिद्धिः । अभावे जगतोऽभावत्वे तदभावाज्जगदभावस्यावश्यंभावात्कुतस्तत्सिद्धिरिति ॥

[1] नन्वभावस्याभावरूपत्वात्कर्मैव जगत्कारणमस्तु । किं प्रधानकल्पनयेत्यत आह ॥

[2] उपादानत्वायोगात् is the lection accepted by Vijnána, and by him only. *Ed.*

[3] It is the bracketed Aph. 56, at p. 58, *supra*, that is here referred to. *Ed.*

[4] निमित्तं कारणमदृष्टमस्तु धर्माधर्मयोस्तूपा-

b. But then [some one may say], since Liberation can be attained by undertaking the things directed by the Veda, what occasion is there for [our troubling ourselves about] *Nature?* To this he replies:[1]

नानुश्रविकादपि तत्सिद्धिः साध्यत्वेनावृत्तियोगा-
दपुरुषार्थत्वम् ॥ ८२ ॥

Salvation is not to be obtained by ritual observances.

Aph. 82. The accomplishment thereof [i.e., of Liberation,] is not, moreover, through Scriptural rites: the chief end of man does not consist in this [which is gained through such means]; because, since this consists of what is accomplished through *acts,* [and is, therefore, a *product,* and not *eternal*], there is [still left impending over the ritualist,] the liability to repetition of births.

a. 'Scriptural means,' such as sacrifices, [are so called], because they are heard from [the mouth of the instructor in] Scripture. Not thereby, moreover, is 'the accomplishment thereof,' i.e., the accomplishment of Liberation; 'because one is liable to repetition of births, by reason of the fact that it [the supposed Liberation,] was accomplished by *means,*' i.e., because the [thus far] liberated

---

दानकारणत्वं न क्वचिद्दृष्टं कल्पना हि दृष्टानुसारेणैव भवति। प्रकृतिपुरुषविवेकदर्शनान्मुक्तिरिति प्रकृतिस्वीकारः ॥

[1] ननु वेदोक्तार्थानुष्ठानादेव मुक्तिसंभवात्किं प्रकत्येत्यत आह ॥

[soul] is still liable to repetition of births,[1] inasmuch as this [its supposed Liberation,] is not *eternal*, [just] because it is [the result of] *acts*. For *this* reason, the chief end of man does not consist in this,[2] [which is gained through ritual observances].

b. He shows what *does* constitute the chief end of man:[3]

तत्र प्राप्तविवेकस्यानावृत्तिश्रुतिः ॥ ८३ ॥

In regard to the attainment of the chief end of man, the Scripture concurs with the Sánkhya

Aph. 83. There is Scripture for it, that he who has attained to discrimination, in regard to these [i.e., Nature and Soul], has no repetition of births.

a. 'In regard to these,' i.e., in regard to Nature and Soul, of him who has attained to discrimination, there is a text declaring, that, in consequence of his knowledge of the distinction, there will be no repetition of births; the text, viz., '*He* does not return again,'[4] &c.[5]

---

[1] Literally, 'liable to return to mundane existence.' *Ed.*

[2] वेदादनुश्रूयत इत्यानुश्रविको यज्ञादिः। तस्मादपि न तत्सिद्धिर्मोक्षसिद्धिः साध्यत्वेनावृत्तियोगात्कर्मत्वेनानित्यत्वान्मुक्तस्य पुनः संसारावृत्तियोगः। तस्मादपुरुषार्थत्वम् ॥

[3] पुरुषार्थत्वं दर्शयति ॥

[4] Compare the *Chhándogya Upanishad*, viii., xv. *Ed.*

[5] तत्र प्रकृतिपुरुषयोः प्राप्तविवेकस्य विवेकज्ञानादनावृत्तिश्रुतिः। न स पुनरावर्तत इति श्रुतिः ॥

b. He states an objection to the opposite view :[1]

दुःखाद्दुःखं जलाभिषेकवन्न जाड्यविमोकः ॥ ८४ ॥

Pain can lead only to pain, not to liberation from it.

Aph. 84. From pain [occasioned, e.g., to victims in sacrifice,] must come pain [to the sacrificer, and not *liberation* from pain]; as there is not relief from chilliness, by affusion of water.

a. If Liberation were to be effected by *acts*, [such as sacrifices], then, since the acts involve a variety of pains, Liberation itself [on the principle that every effect includes the qualities of its cause,] would include a variety of pains; and it would be a grief, from the fact that it must eventually end: for, to one who is distressed by chilliness the affusion of water does not bring liberation from his chilliness, but, rather, [additional] chilliness.[2]

b. But then [some one may say], the fact that the act is productive of pain is not the *motive* [to the performance of sacrifice]; but the [real] reason is this, that the act is productive of *things desirable*. And, in accordance with this, there is the text, 'By means of acts [of sacrifice] they may partake of immortality,' &c. To this he replies :[3]

---

[1] विपक्षे दोषमाह ॥

[2] यदि कर्मसाध्यो मोक्षो भवेत्कर्मणा दुःखबहुलत्वान्मोक्षोऽपि दुःखबहुलः स्यादन्ततः क्षयित्वेनापि दुःखं स्यान्नहि जाड्यार्त्तस्य जाड्यविमोको जलाभिषेकात्प्रत्युत जाड्यमेवेति ॥

[3] ननु दुःखस्य कर्मसाध्यत्वमप्रयोजकं किं तु का-

काम्येऽकाम्येऽपि[1] साध्यत्वाविशेषात् ॥ ८५ ॥

The character of the end contemplated makes no difference in regard to the transitoriness of what is effected by works.

Aph. 85. [Liberation cannot arise from acts]; because, whether the end be something desirable, or undesirable, [and we admit that the *motive* of the sacrifice is not the giving pain to the victim], this makes no difference in regard to its being the result of *acts*, [and, therefore, not eternal, but transitory].

a. Grant that pain is not what is [intended] to be accomplished by works done without desire, [on the part of the virtuous sacrificer], still, though there *is* a difference [as you contend,] between [an act done to secure] something enjoyable and an act done without reference to enjoyment, this makes no difference with respect to the fact of the Liberation's being produced by *acts*, [which, I repeat, *permanent* Liberation cannot be]: there must still again be pain; for it [the Liberation supposed to have been attained through works,] must be perishable, because it is a *production*. The text which declares that works done without desire are instruments of Liberation has reference to *knowledge*, [which, I grant, may be gained by such means]; and Liberation comes through knowledge; so that these [works] are instruments of Liberation

---

म्यकर्मसाध्यत्वं हेतुः। तथा च श्रुतिः कर्मभ्यो ऽमृतत्वमानशुरिति। तत्राह ॥

[1] The reading of Aniruddha, according to my MSS., is काम्याकामेऽपि. *Ed.*

mediately:[1] [but you will recollect that the present inquiry regards the *immediate* cause].

b. [But then, some one may say], supposing that Liberation may take place [as you Sánkhyas contend,] through the knowledge of the distinction between Nature and Soul, still, since, from the perishableness [of the Liberation effected by *this* means, as well as any other means], mundane life may return, we are both on an equality, [*we*, whose Liberation you Sánkhyas look upon as transitory, and you Sánkhyas, whose Liberation we, again, look upon as being, by parity of reasoning, in much the same predicament]. To this he replies:[2]

निजमुक्तस्य बन्धध्वंसमात्रे[3] परं न समानत्वम्॥ ८६॥

---

[1] मा भून्निष्कामकर्मसाध्यं दुःखं तथापि काम्यान्निष्कामकर्मविशेषेऽपि मोक्षस्य कर्मसाध्यत्वमविशिष्टं साध्यत्वात्क्षयित्वेन पुनरपि दुःखं स्यात्। निष्कामकर्मणो मोक्षसाधनत्वश्रुतिः ज्ञानार्थं ज्ञानाच्च मोक्ष इति पारम्पर्येण मोक्षसाधनत्वम्॥

[2] यदि प्रकृतिपुरुषविवेकज्ञानान्मोक्षो भवेत्तथापि क्षयित्वात्पुनरपि संसार इत्यावयोस्तुल्यत्वमित्यत आह॥

[3] Dr. Ballantyne, on republishing the Sánkhya Aphorisms in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, adopted the genuine reading, बन्धध्वंसमात्रं, instead of that given above, which I find, indeed, in the Serampore edition of the *Sánkhya-pravachana-bháshya*, but in no MS. He ought, however, at the same time, to have altered his translation,

The right means effect Liberation once for all.

Aph. 86. Of him who is essentially liberated, his bonds having absolutely perished, it [i.e., the fruit of his saving knowledge,] is absolute: there is no parity [between his case and that of him who relies on works, and who may thereby secure a temporary sojourn in Paradise, only to return again to earth].

a. Of him 'who is essentially liberated,' who, in his very essence, is free, there is the destruction of bondage. The bond [see § 56,[1]] is Non-discrimination [between Nature and Soul]. By the removal thereof there is the destruction, the annihilation, of Non-discrimination: and how is it possible that there should again be a return of the mundane state, when the destruction of Non-discrimination is *absolute?* Thus there is no [such] similarity,[2] [between the two cases, as is imagined, by the objector, under § 85. *b.*].

b. It has been asserted [in § 61,] that there is a class of twenty-five [things which are realities]; and, since these cannot be ascertained [or made out to be *true*], except by

---

which, in conformity with the unadulterated text, might have run somewhat as follows: 'Of him who is, in himself, liberated all extinction of bondage is final,' &c. Such is the interpretation which, on comparison of the various commentaries, seems to be the most eligible. *Ed.*

[1] This is the Aphorism bracketed at p. 58, *supra*. *Ed.*

[2] निजमुक्तस्य स्वभावमुक्तस्य बन्धध्वंसः। बन्धोऽविवेकः। तद्विरोधेनाविवेकध्वंसो नाशः। अविवेकनाशस्य च प्रध्वंसत्वात्कुतः संसारस्य पुनरावर्तनमिति न समत्वम् ॥

proof, therefore he displays this;[1] [i.e., he shows what he *means* by proof]:

द्वयोरेकतरस्य [2]वाप्यसंनिकृष्टार्थपरिच्छित्तिः प्रमा। तत्साधकतमं[3] यत्तत् ॥ ८७ ॥

What is meant by evidence.

Aph. 87. The determination of something not [previously] lodged in both [the Soul and the Intellect], nor in one or other of them, is 'right notion' (*pramá*). What is, in the highest degree, productive thereof [i. e., of any given 'right notion'], is that; [i. e., is what we mean by proof, or evidence, (*pramáṇa*)].

a. 'Not lodged,' i. e., not deposited in 'one rightly cognizing' (*pramátṛi*); in short, not previously known. The 'determination,' i.e., the ascertainment [or right apprehension] of such a thing, or reality, is 'right notion'; and, whether this be an affection 'of *both*,' i.e., of Intellect, and also of Soul [as some hold that it is], or of only one or other of the two, [as others hold,] *either* way, 'what is, in the highest degree, productive' of this 'right notion' is [what we term proof, or] evidence, (*pramáṇa*): such is the definition of evidence in general; [the definition of its several species falling to be considered hereafter]: such is the meaning.[4]

---

[1] पञ्चविंशतिगंण इत्युक्तं तत्सिद्धिश्च न प्रमाणेन विनेति तद्दर्शयति ॥

[2] Nágesa has वाऽसं॰. *Ed.*

[3] Some MSS. have the inferior reading -साधकं. *Ed.*

[4] असंनिकृष्टः प्रमातर्यनारूढोऽनधिगत इति

b. It is with a view to the exclusion of Memory, Error, and Doubt, in their order, that we employ [when speaking of the result of evidence,] the expressions 'not previously known' [which excludes things remembered], and 'reality' [which excludes mistakes and fancies], and 'discrimination,'[1] [which excludes doubt].

c. In regard to this [topic of knowledge and the sources of knowledge], if 'right notion,' is spoken of as located in the *Soul* [see § 87. *a.*], then the [proof, or] evidence is an affection of the *Intellect*. If [on the other hand, the 'right notion' is spoken of as] located in the Intellect, in the shape of an affection [of that the affections of which are mirrored by the Soul], then it [the proof, or evidence, or whatever we may choose to call that from which 'right notion' results,] is just the conjunction of an organ [with its appropriate object; such conjunction giving rise to sense-perception], &c. But, if *both* the Soul's cognition and the affections of the Intellect are spoken of as [cases of] 'right notion,' then *both* of these aforesaid [the affection of the Intellect, in the first case, and the conjunction of an organ with its appropriate object, &c., in the other

---

यावत्। एवंभूतस्यार्थस्य वस्तुनः परिच्छित्तिरवधारणं प्रमा सा च द्वयोर्बुद्धिपुरुषयोरेव धर्मो भवतु किं वैकतरमात्रस्योभयथैव तस्याः प्रमाया यत्साधकतमं तत्प्रमाणमिति प्रमाणसामान्यलक्षणमित्यर्थः ॥

[1] स्मृतिभ्रमसंशयव्युदासाय क्रमेणानधिगत इति वस्तुन इत्यवधारणमिति ॥

case,] are [to receive the name of] proof (*pramáṇa*). You are to understand, that, when the organ of vision, &c., are spoken of as 'evidence,' it is only as being *mediately*[1] [the sources of right knowledge].

d. How many [kinds of] proofs [then,] are there? To this he replies:[2]

त्रिविधं प्रमाणं[3] तत्सिद्धौ सर्वसिद्धेर्नाधिक्यसिद्धिः ॥ ८८ ॥

There are three kinds of evidence.

Aph. 88. Proof is of three kinds: there is no establishment of more; because, if these be established, then all [that is true] can be established [by one or other of these three proofs].

a. 'Proof is of three kinds;' that is to say, 'perception'

---

[1] अत्र यदि प्रमारूपं फलं पुरुषनिष्ठमुच्यते तदा बुद्धिवृत्तिरेव प्रमाणम्। यदि बुद्धिनिष्ठं वृत्तिरूपं तदा तदेन्द्रियसंनिकर्षादिरेव। यदि तु पौरुषेयबोधो बुद्धिवृत्तिश्चोभयमपि प्रमेत्युच्यते तदोक्तमुभयमेव प्रमाणं भवति। चक्षुरादिषु प्रमाणव्यवहारः परंपरयैवेति बोध्यम् ॥

[2] कति प्रमाणानीत्यत आह ॥

[3] So reads Aniruddha; but Vijnána, Nágeśa, and Vedánti Mahádeva end the eighty-seventh Aphorism with these two words. Hence: 'That which is, in the highest degree, productive thereof is proof, of three kinds.' *Ed.*

(*pratyaksha*), 'the recognition of signs' (*anumána*), and 'testimony' (*śabda*), are the [three kinds of] proofs.[1]

b. But then [some one may incline to say], let 'comparison' [which is reckoned, in the Nyáya, a specifically distinct source of knowledge], and the others [such as 'Conjecture,' &c., which are reckoned, in like manner, in the Mímáṁsá], also be instruments of right knowledge, [as well as these three], in [the matter of] the discriminating of Nature and Soul: he therefore says, 'because, if these [three] be established,' &c. And, since, if there be the three kinds of proof established,' everything [that is really true] can be established [by means of them], there is no establishment of more;' no addition to the proofs can be fairly made out; because of the cumbrousness [that sins against the philosophical maxim, that we are not to assume more than is necessary to account for the case]: such is the meaning.[2]

c. For the same reason, Manu, also, has laid down only a triad of proofs, where he says [see the Institutes, Ch. xii., v. 105]: 'By that man who seeks a distinct knowledge of his duty, [these] three [sources of right knowledge] must be well understood, viz., Perception, Inference, and Scriptural authority in its various shapes [of legal institute,

---

[1] त्रिविधं प्रमाणमिति प्रत्यक्षानुमानशब्दाः प्रमाणानीत्यर्थः ॥

[2] ननूपमानाद्यपि प्रकृतिपुरुषविवेकप्रमाणमस्त्विति । अत आह तत्सिद्धाविति । त्रिविधप्रमाणसिद्धौ च सर्वस्यार्थस्य सिद्धेर्नाधिक्यसिद्धिर्न प्रमाणाधिक्यं सिद्ध्यति गौरवादित्यर्थः ॥

&c.].' And 'Comparison,' and 'Tradition' *(aitihya)*, and the like, are included under Inference and Testimony; and 'Non-perception' *(anupalabdhi)* and the like are included under Perception;[1] [for the non-perception of an absent jar on a particular spot of ground is nothing else than the perception of that spot of ground *without* a jar on it].

d. He [next] states the definitions of the varieties[2] [of proof, having already (§ 87) given the general definition]:

[3]यत्संबद्धं[4] सत्तदाकारोल्लेखि विज्ञानं तत्प्रत्यक्षम् ॥ ८९ ॥

Perception defined.

Aph. 89. Perception *(pratyaksha)* is that discernment which, being in conjunction [with the thing perceived], portrays the form thereof.

a. 'Being in conjunction,' [literally,] 'existing in con-

---

[1] अत एव मनुनापि प्रमाणत्रयमेवोपन्यस्तम् । प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं च शास्त्रं च विविधागमम् । त्रयं सुविदितं कार्यं धर्मशुद्धिमभीप्सतेति । उपमानैतिह्यादीनां चानुमानशब्दयोः प्रवेशोऽनुपलब्ध्यादीनां च प्रत्यक्षे प्रवेश इति ॥

[2] विशेषलक्षणमाह ॥

[3] Aniruddha has यत्संबन्धसिद्धं तदा°, yielding 'determined by,' &c., instead of 'being in,' &c. *Ed.*

[4] Vedánti Mahádeva has यत्संबन्धं (?). *Ed.*

junction;' 'portrays the form thereof,' i.e., assumes the form of the thing with which it is in conjunction [as water assumes the form of the vessel into which it is poured]; what 'discernment,' or affection of the Intellect, [does *this*], that [affection of the Intellect (see Yoga Aphorisms, I., § 5 and § 8. *b.*)] is the evidence [called] Perception: such is the meaning.[1]

b. But then, [some one may say,] this [definition of Perception (§ 89)] does not extend [as we conceive it ought, and presume it is intended, to do,] to the perception, by adepts in the *Yoga*, of things past, future, or concealed [by stone walls, or such intervening things as interrupt ordinary perception]; because there is, here, no 'form of the thing, in *conjunction*' [with the mind of him who perceives it, while absent]: having pondered this doubt, he corrects it by [stating, as follows,] the fact, that this [supernatural sort of perception] is not what he intends to define:[2]

योगिनामबाह्यप्रत्यक्षत्वान्न दोषः ॥ ९० ॥

---

[1] संबद्धं सत्संबद्धं भवत्तदाकारोल्लेखि संबद्धवस्त्वाकारधारि भवति यद्विज्ञानं बुद्धिवृत्तिस्तत्प्रत्यक्षं प्रमाणमित्यर्थः ॥

[2] ननु योगिनामतीतानागतव्यवहितवस्तुप्रत्यक्षेऽव्याप्तिः संबद्धवस्त्वाकाराभावादित्याशङ्क्य तस्यालक्ष्यत्वेन समाधत्ते ॥

The definition not to be blamed, though it should not apply to the perceptions of the mystic.

Aph. 90. It is not a fault [in the definition, that it does not apply to the perceptions of adepts in the *Yoga*]; because that of the adepts in the *Yoga* is not an *external* perception.

a. That is to say: it is only *sense*-perception that is to be here defined; and the adepts of the Yoga do not perceive through the *external* [organs of sense]. Therefore there is no fault [in our definition]; i.e., there is no *failure* to include the perceptions of these;[1] [because there is no *intention* to include them].

b. [But, although this reply is as much as the objector has any right to expect,] he states the real justification[2] [of the definition in question]:

लीनवस्तुलब्धातिशयसंबन्धाद्वादोषः[3] ॥ ९१ ॥

But the definition does apply to the perceptions of the mystic.

Aph. 91. Or, there is no fault [in the definition], because of the conjunction, with *causal* things, of that [mystical mind] which has attained exaltation.[4]

---

[1] ऐन्द्रियकप्रत्यक्षमेवात्र लक्ष्यं योगिनश्चाबाह्यप्रत्यक्षकाः। अतो न दोषो न तत्प्रत्यक्षेऽव्याप्तिरित्यर्थः॥

[2] वास्तवं समाधानमाह॥

[3] Thus Vijnána and Vedánti Mahádeva. Aniruddha has -संबन्धान्न दोषः. The reading of Nágeśa is -संबन्धाद्वा न दोषः. *Ed.*

[4] For the term *atiśaya*, again rendered, in the next page, by 'exaltation,' *vide infra*, p. 115, note 4. *Ed.*

a. Or, be it so that the perception of the *Yogí*, also, shall be the thing to be defined; still there is no fault [in our definition, § 89]; it does not fail to extend [to this, also]; since the mind of the *Yogí*, in the exaltation gained from the habitude produced by concentration, *does* come into conjunction with things [as existent] in their causes,[1] [whether or not with the things as developed into products perceptible by the external senses].

b. Here the word rendered 'causal' *(lína)* denotes the things, *not* in conjunction [with the senses], alluded to by the objector [in § 89. *b.*]; for *we*, who assert that effects *exist* [from eternity, in their causes, before taking the shape of effects, and, likewise, in these same causes, when again resolved into their causes], hold that even what is past, &c., still essentially exists, and that, hence, its conjunction [with the mind of the mystic, or the clairvoyant,] is possible.[2]

Objection, that the definition does not apply to the perceptions of the 'Lord.'

c. But then, [some one may say,] still this [definition] does not extend to the *Lord's* perceptions; because, since these are from everlasting, they can-

[1] अथ वास्तु योगिप्रत्यक्षमपि लक्ष्यं तथापि न दोषो नाव्याप्तिर्यतो लीनवस्तुषु लब्धयोगजधर्मजन्यातिशयस्य योगिचित्तस्य संबन्धो घटते ॥

[2] अत्र लीनशब्दः पराभिप्रेतासंनिकृष्टवाची सत्कार्यवादिनां ह्यतीतादिकमपि स्वरूपतोऽस्तीति तत्संबन्धः संभवेदिति ॥

not *result* from [emergent] conjunction. To this he replies:[1]

ईश्वरासिद्धेः ॥ ९२ ॥

That any 'Lord' exists is not proved.

Aph. 92. [This objection to the definition of Perception has no force]; because it is not proved that there *is* a Lord (*íśwara*).

a. That there is no fault [in the definition of Perception], because there is no proof that there *is* a Lord, is supplied[2] [from § 90].

b. And this demurring to there being any 'Lord' is merely in accordance with[3] the arrogant dictum of [certain] partisans [who hold an opinion not recognized by the majority]. Therefore, it is to be understood, the expression employed is, 'because it is *not proved* that there is a Lord,' but not the expression, 'because there *is no* Lord.'[4]

---

[1] ननु तथापीश्वरप्रत्यक्षेऽव्याप्तिस्तस्य नित्यत्वेनासंनिकर्षजन्यत्वात् । तत्राह ॥

[2] ईश्वरे प्रमाणाभावाददोष इत्यनुवर्तते ॥

[3] Rather, 'And this [mere] taking exception to a Lord is expressly owing to,' &c. The aphorist would not be confounded with those who denied what he waited to see evidenced. The attitude which he assumed is that of suspense of judgment on the point of theism, as against the positiveness of the professed atheist. Vijnána, here followed, then goes on to say: अन्यथा हीश्वराभावादित्येवोच्येत । 'For, otherwise [i. e., if the aphorist had been atheistic], it would have been explicitly declared, Because of the non-existence of a Lord.' *Ed.*

[4] अयं चेश्वरप्रतिषेध एकदेशिनां प्रौढवादेनैवे-

c. But, on the implication[1] that there *is* a 'Lord,' what we mean to speak of [in our definition of Perception, (§89),] is merely the being of the [same] kind with what is produced by conjunction[2] [of a sense-organ with its object; and the perceptions of the 'Lord' may be of the same *kind* with such perceptions, though they were not to come from the same *source*].

d. Having pondered the doubt, '*How* should the Lord not be proved [to exist] by the Scripture and the Law, [which declare his existence]?' he states a dilemma which excludes [this]:[3]

मुक्तबद्धयोरन्यतराभावान्न तत्सिद्धिः ॥ ९३ ॥

A dilemma, to exclude proof that there is any 'Lord.'

Aph. 93. [And, further,] it is not proved that he [the 'Lord,'] exists; because [whoever exists must be either free or bound; and], of free and bound, he can be neither the one nor the other.

a. The 'Lord' whom you imagine, tell us, is he free from troubles, &c.? Or is he in bondage through these?

ति । अत एवेश्वरासिद्धेरित्युक्तं न त्वीश्वराभावादिति बोध्यम् ॥

1 Rather, 'the view being accepted' (*abhyupagame*).

2 ईश्वराभ्युपगमे तु संनिकर्षजन्यजातीयत्वमेव विवक्षितम् ॥

3 श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यां कथमीशो न सिध्येदित्याशङ्क्य तर्कविरोधं बाधकमाह ॥

Since he is not, cannot be, either the one or the other, it is not proved that there is a 'Lord:' such is the meaning.[1]

b. He explains this very point:[2]

उभयथाप्यसत्करत्वम्[3] ॥ ९४ ॥

The force of the dilemma.

Aph. 94. [Because,] either way, he would be inefficient.

a. Since, if he were free, he would have no desires, &c., which [as compulsory motives,] would instigate him to create; and, if he were bound, he would be under delusion; he must be [on either alternative,] unequal to the creation, &c.[4] [of this world].

b. But then, [it may be asked,] if such be the case, what becomes of the Scripture-texts which declare the 'Lord?' To this he replies:[5]

---

[1] ईश्वरोऽभिमतः किं क्लेशादिभिर्मुक्तो वा तैर्बद्धो वा । अन्यतरस्याप्यभावादसंभवान्नेश्वरसिद्धिरित्यर्थः ॥

[2] तदेवाह ॥

[3] The reading, in a later handwriting, of one of my MSS. of Aniruddha is -सत्कर्तृत्वम्. *Ed.*

[4] मुक्तत्वे सृष्टिप्रयोजकरागाद्यभावाद्बद्धत्वे च मूढत्वान्न सृष्ट्यादिक्षमत्वमित्यर्थः ॥

[5] नन्वेवमीश्वरप्रतिपादकश्रुतीनां का गतिः । तत्राह ॥

मुक्तात्मनः प्रशंसा[1] उपासा सिद्धस्य[2] वा ॥ ९५ ॥

The import of the texts which speak of the 'Lord.'

Aph. 95. [The Scriptural texts which make mention of the 'Lord' are] either glorifications of the liberated Soul, or homages to the recognized[3] [deities of the Hindu pantheon].[4]

a. That is to say: accordingly as the case may be, *some* text [among those in which the term 'Lord' occurs,] is intended, in the shape of a glorification [of Soul], as the 'Lord,' [as Soul is held to be], merely in virtue of junction [with Nature], to incite [to still deeper contemplation], to exhibit, as what is to be known, the liberated Soul, i. e., absolute Soul in general; and some other text, declaratory, for example, of creatorship, &c., preceded by resolution [to create, is intended] to extol [and to purify the mind of the contemplator, by enabling him to take a part in extolling] the eternity, &c., of the familiarly known[3] Brahmá,

---

1 Another reading, that of Nágeśa and of Vedánti Mahádeva, प्रशंसोपा°, makes this word of the singular number. *Ed.*

2 उपासासिद्धस्य, a compound, is the reading of Aniruddha, followed by Vedánti Mahádeva. See 4, below. *Ed.*

3 In both places, *siddha*, 'possessor of supernatural powers' *Ed.*

4 Aniruddha's exposition of this Aphorism is as follows रा-गाद्यभावान्मुक्तात्मन इव मुक्तात्मनो न तु मुक्तस्य तस्य संकल्पकर्तृत्वाद्यभावात्। तत्प्रशंसा विधिवाक्योत्तम्भनाय। उपासासिद्धस्य। उपासनया लब्धातिशयस्य योगिनोऽणिमादिसिद्धस्य प्रशंसा-

Vishṇu, Śiva, or other *non*-eternal 'Lord;' since these, though possessed of the conceit [of individuality], &c., [and, in so far, liable to perish], have immortality, &c., in a secondary sense;[1] [seeing that the Soul, in *every* combination, is immortal, though the combination itself is not so].

b. But then, [some one may say], even if it were thus [as alleged under § 95], what is heard in Scripture, [viz.], the fact that it [viz., Soul] is the *governor* of Nature, &c., would not be the case; for, in the world, we speak of government in reference only to modifications [preceded and determined] by resolutions [that so and so shall take place], &c. To this he replies:[2]

भ्यासोत्तम्भनायेति । According to this, the term *íswara*, 'mighty one,' 'lord,' is applied, by way of eulogy, either to a soul as it were liberated, or to a person who, through devotion, has acquired transcendent faculties, that is to say, the *Yogí*. Resolution, agentship, and the like, are impredicable of one absolutely liberated; and such a one, being inert and impassive, cannot be intended by *íswara*, 'a power.' Hence the expression, 'as it were liberated.' Also see, for *atiśaya*,—translated, above, 'transcendent faculties,'—Book IV., Aph. 24. *Ed.*

[1] यथायोगं काचिच्छ्रुतिर्मुक्तात्मनः केवलात्मसामान्यस्य ज्ञेयताविधानाय संनिधिमात्रैश्वर्येण स्तुतिरूपा प्ररोचनार्था काचिच्च संकल्पपूर्वकसृष्ट्यादिप्रतिपादिका श्रुतिः सिद्धस्य ब्रह्मविष्णुहरादेरेवानित्येश्वरस्याभिमानादिमतोऽपि गौणनित्यत्वादिमत्त्वान्नित्यत्वाद्युपासापरेत्यर्थः ॥

[2] ननु तथापि प्रकृत्याद्यधिष्ठातृत्वं श्रूयमाणं नो-

तत्संनिधानादधिष्ठातृत्वं मणिवत् ॥ ९६ ॥

Soul, like the lodestone, acts not by resolve, but through proximity.

Aph. 96. The governorship [thereof, i.e., of Soul over Nature] is from [its] proximity thereto, [not from its resolving to act thereon]; as is the case with the gem, [the lodestone, in regard to iron].

a. If it were alleged that [its, Soul's,] creativeness, or [its] governorship, was through a *resolve* [to create, or to govern], then this objection [brought forward under § 95. *b.*] would apply. But [it is not so; for,] by *us* [Sánkhyas,] it is held that the Soul's governorship, in the shape of creatorship, or the like, is merely from [its] *proximity* [to Nature]; 'as is the case with the [lodestone] gem.'[1]

b. As the gem, the lodestone, is attracted by iron merely by proximity, without resolving [either to act or to be acted on], &c., so, by the mere conjunction of the primal Soul, Nature is changed into the principle [called] the 'Great one,' [or Mind, (see § 61. *c.*)]. And in this alone consists [what we speak of as] its acting as *creator* towards that which is superadded to it: such is the meaning.[2]

पपद्यते लोके संकल्पादिना परिणमनस्यैवाधिष्ठानव्यवहारादिति । तत्राह ॥

[1] यदि संकल्पेन स्रष्टृत्वमधिष्ठातृत्वमुच्यते तदायं दोषः स्यात् । अस्माभिस्तु पुरुषस्य संनिधानादेवाधिष्ठातृत्वं स्रष्टृत्वादिरूपमिष्यते मणिवत् ॥

[2] यथायस्कान्तमणेः सान्निध्यमात्रेण लोहाकर्षकत्वं संकल्पादिना विना तथैवादिपुरुषस्य संयो-

c. And thus it is declared, [in some one of the Puráṉas[1]]: 'As the iron acts, whilst the gem [the lodestone,] stands void of volition, just so this world is created by a deity who is mere Existence. Thus it is, that there are, in the Soul, both agency [seemingly,] and non-agency, [really]. It is *not* an agent, inasmuch as it is void of volition; [and it *is*] an agent, merely through approximation [to Nature].'[2]

d. In respect of worldly products, also, animal souls overrule, merely through their approximation [to Nature]: so he declares [as follows]:[3]

विशेषकार्येष्वपि[4] जीवानाम् ॥ ९७ ॥

गमात्रेण प्रकृतेर्महत्तत्त्वरूपेण परिणमनम् । इद-मेव च स्वोपाधिस्रष्टृत्वमित्यर्थः ॥

1 The Translator's authority for this attribution has not been discovered. *Ed.*

2 तथाचोक्तम् । निरिच्छे संस्थिते रत्ने यथा लोहः प्रवर्तते । सत्तामात्रेण देवेन तथैवेयं जगज्जनिः । अत आत्मनि कर्तृत्वमकर्तृत्वं च संस्थितम् । निरिच्छत्वादकर्तासौ कर्ता सन्निधिमात्रत इति ॥

3 लौकिककार्येष्वपि जीवानां संनिधिमात्रेणैवाधिष्ठातृत्वमित्याह ॥

4 Aniruddha has विशेषकार्येऽपि. *Ed.*

In like manner, embodied souls do not energize.

Aph. 97. In the case of individual products, also, [the apparent agency] of animal souls [is solely through proximity].

a. 'The agency is solely through proximity:' so much is supplied[1] [from § 96].

b. The meaning is this, that, in the case, also, of particular productions,—the creation, &c., of things individual [as contradistinguished from that of all things in the lump, (see *Vedánta-sára,* § 67)],—animal souls, i.e., souls in which the intellects [of individuals] reflect themselves [see § 99. *a.*], overrule, merely through proximity, but not through any effort; seeing that these [animal souls] are none other than the motionless Thought.[2]

c. But then, [some one may say], if there were no eternal and omniscient 'Lord,' through the doubt of a blind tradition, [in the absence of an intelligently effective guardianship], the *Vedas* would cease to be an authority; [a possibility which, of course, cannot be entertained for an instant]. To this he replies:[3]

---

[1] अधिष्ठातृत्वं संनिधानादेवेत्यनुषज्यते ॥

[2] विशेषकार्येषु व्यष्टिसृष्ट्यादिष्वपि जीवानामन्तःकरणप्रतिबिम्बितचेतनानां संनिधानादेवाधिष्ठातृत्वं न तु केनापि व्यवहारेण कूटस्थचिन्मात्रत्वादित्यर्थः ॥

[3] ननु नित्यसर्वज्ञेश्वराभावेऽन्धपरंपराशङ्कया वेदाप्रामाण्यं स्यात् । अत आह ॥

सिद्धरूपबोद्धृत्वाद्वाक्यार्थोपदेशः ॥ ९८ ॥

How the Vedas need not the 'Lord' to authenticate them.

Aph. 98. The declaration of the texts or sense [of the Veda, by Brahmá, for example], since *he* knows the truth, [*is* authorative evidence].

a. To complete [the aphorism, we must say], 'since *Hiranyagarbha* [i.e., *Brahmá*,] and others [viz., *Vishnu* and *Śiva*], are knowers of what is certain, i.e., of what is true, the declaration of the texts or sense of the Vedas, where *these* are the speakers, *is* evidence[1] [altogether indisputable].

b. But then, if Soul, by its simple proximity [to Nature (§ 96)], is an overruler in a *secondary* sense [only of the term,—as the magnet may be said, in a secondary sense, to draw the iron, while the conviction is entertained, that, actually and literally, the iron draws the magnet],—who is the *primary* [or actual,] overruler? In reference to this, he says:[2]

---

[1] हिरण्यगर्भादीनां सिद्धरूपस्य यथार्थस्य बोद्धृत्वात्तद्वक्तृको वेदवाक्यार्थोपदेशः प्रमाणमिति शेषः ॥

[2] ननु पुरुषस्य चेत्संनिधिमात्रेण गौणमधिष्ठातृत्वं तर्हि मुख्यमधिष्ठातृत्वं कस्येत्याकाङ्क्षायामाह ॥

अन्तःकरणस्य[1] तदुज्ज्वलितत्वाल्लोहवदधिष्ठातृत्वम् ॥ ९९ ॥

It is in the shape of the internal organ, that Nature affects Soul.

Aph. 99. The internal organ, through its being enlightened thereby [i.e., by Soul], is the overruler; as is the iron, [in respect of the magnet].

a. The internal organ, i.e., the understanding, is the overruler, through its fancying itself to be Soul, [as it does fancy,] by reason of its being enlightened by the Soul, through its happening to reflect itself in [and contemplate itself in,] Soul; 'just as the iron,' that is to say, as the attracting iron, though inactive, draws [the magnet], in consequence of [its] mere proximity,[2] [and so acquires magnetism by magnetic induction].

b. He [now, having discussed the evidence that consists in direct perception,] states the definition of inference[3] (*anumána*):

---

1 Aniruddha has महतोऽन्तःकरणस्य; prefixing to 'the internal organ' the synonymous 'the Great One.' *Ed.*

2 अन्तःकरणस्य बुद्धेः पुरुषच्छायापत्त्या तेन चैतन्येनोज्ज्वलितत्वाच्चेतनत्वाभिमानादधिष्ठातृत्वं लोहवदिति यथाकर्षको लोहो निष्क्रियोऽपि संनिधिमात्रेण कर्षतीति ॥

3 अनुमानलक्षणमाह ॥

प्रतिबन्धदृशः[1] प्रतिबद्धज्ञानमनुमानम् ॥ १०० ॥

Inference defined.

Aph. 100. The knowledge of the connected [e.g., fire], through perception of the connexion [e.g., of fire with smoke], is inference.

a. That is to say: inference [or conviction of a general truth,] is [a kind of] evidence consisting in a [mental] modification, [which is none other than] the knowledge of the connected, i.e., of the constant accompanier, through the knowledge of the constant accompaniment: by 'connexion' (*pratibandha*) here being meant 'constant attendedness' (*vyápti*); and through the perception thereof[2] [it being that the mind has possession of any general principle].

b. But a conclusion (*anumiti*) is knowledge of the soul;[3] [whilst an Inference, so far forth as it is an instrument in the establishment of knowledge deducible from it, is an affection of the internal organ, or understanding (see §87. *c.*)]

c. He [next] defines testimony[4] (*śabda*):

---

[1] प्रतिबद्धदृशः is the reading of Nágeśa and of Vedánti Mahádeva. *Ed.*

[2] प्रतिबन्धो व्याप्तिस्तद्दृशो व्याप्तिज्ञानात्प्रतिबद्धस्य व्यापकस्य ज्ञानं वृत्तिरूपमनुमानं प्रमाणमित्यर्थः ॥

[3] अनुमितिस्तु पौरुषेयो बोध इति ॥

[4] शब्दं लक्षयति ॥

आप्तोपदेशः शब्दः ॥ १०१ ॥

Valid testimony defined.

Aph. 101. Testimony [such as is entitled to the name of evidence,] is a declaration by one worthy [to be believed].

a. Here 'fitness' means 'suitableness;' and so the evidence which is called 'Testimony' is the knowledge arising from a suitable declaration: such is the meaning. And [while this belongs to the understanding, or internal organ (see § 100. *b.*)] the result is that [knowledge] in the Soul, [which is called] 'knowledge by hearing'[1] (*śabda-bodha*).

b. He [next] volunteers to tell us what is the use of his setting forth [the various divisions of] evidence:[2]

उभयसिद्धिः प्रमाणात्तदुपदेशः ॥ १०२ ॥

Why the kinds of Evidence have been here set forth.

Aph. 102. Since the establishment of [the existence of] both [soul and non-soul] is by means of evidence, the declaration thereof [i.e., of the kinds of evidence, has been here made].

a. It is only by means of evidence that both Soul and non-soul are established as being distinct, [the one from the

---

[1] आप्तिश्च योग्यता तथा च योग्यः शब्दस्तज्जन्यं ज्ञानं शब्दाख्यं प्रमाणमित्यर्थः। फलं च पौरुषेयः शाब्दबोध इति ॥

[2] प्रमाणप्रतिपादनस्य स्वयमेव फलमाह ॥

other]: therefore has this, viz., evidence, been here declared: such is the meaning.[1]

b. Among these [several kinds of proof], he [now] describes that one by which, especially, viz., by a proof which is one kind of inference, Nature and Soul are here to be established discriminatively:[2]

सामान्यतो दृष्टादुभयसिद्धिः[3] ॥ १०३ ॥

The existence of Soul and Nature argued from analogy.

Aph. 103. The establishment of both [Nature and Soul] is by analogy.

a. [Analogy (*sámányato drishta*) is that kind of evidence which is employed in the case] where, by the force [as an argument,] which the residence of any property in the subject derives from a knowledge of its being constantly accompanied [by something which it may therefore betoken], when we have had recourse to [as the means of determining this constant accompaniment,] what is, for instance, generically of a perceptible kind, [where, under such circumstances, we repeat,] anything of a *different* kind, i.e., *not* cognizable by the senses, is established; as when,

---

[1] उभयोरात्मानात्मनोर्विवेकेन सिद्धिः प्रमाणादेव भवति। अतस्तस्य प्रमाणस्योपदेशः कृत इत्यर्थः॥

[2] तत्र येनानुमानविशेषेण प्रमाणेन मुख्यतोऽत्र प्रकृतिपुरुषौ विविच्य साधनीयौ तद्वर्णयति॥

[3] My MS. of Nágeśa has दृष्टात्सिद्धिः. *Ed.*

for example, having apprehended a constant accompaniment, [e.g., that an act implies an instrument], by taking into consideration such instruments as axes, &c., which are of earthy and other kinds, a quite heterogeneous, imperceptible, instrument of *knowledge*, viz., [the instrument named] Sense, is established [or inferred to exist]; such is what we mean by Analogy; and it is by *this* [species of inference], that both, [viz.,] Nature and Soul, are proved [to exist]: such is the meaning.[1]

b. Of these [viz., Nature and Soul,] the argument from analogy for [the existence of] Nature is as follows: the Great Principle [viz., Understanding (see § 61. *c.*)] is formed out of the things [called] Pleasure, Pain, and Delusion, [to the aggregate of which three in equipoise (see § 61) the name of Nature is given]; because, whilst it is [undeniably,] a production, it has the characters of Pleasure, Pain, and Delusion; just as a bracelet, or the like, formed of gold, or the like,[2] [has the characteristic pro-

---

[1] यच्च सामान्यतः प्रत्यक्षादिजातीयमादाय व्याप्तिग्रहात्पक्षधर्मताबलेन तद्विजातीयोऽप्रत्यक्षार्थः सिध्यति यथा पृथिवीत्वादिजातीयं कुठारादिकरणमादाय व्याप्तिं गृहीत्वा तद्विजातीयमतीन्द्रियं ज्ञानकरणमिन्द्रियं साध्यत इति तत्सामान्यतो दृष्टं तस्मादुभयोः प्रकृतिपुरुषयोः सिद्धिरित्यर्थः ॥

[2] तत्र प्रकृतेः सामान्यतो दृष्टमनुमानं यथा महत्तत्त्वं सुखदुःखमोहद्रव्योपादानकं कार्यत्वे सति सुखदुःखमोहधर्मकत्वात्सुवर्णादिजकुण्डलादिवदिति ॥

perties of the gold, or the like, and is thereby known to have been formed out of gold, or the like].

c. But, [as regards the argument from analogy, in proof of the existence] of Soul, [it is, as stated before, under § 66, to the following effect]: Nature is for the sake of *another*; because it is something that acts as a combination; as a house, for instance, [which is a combination of various parts combined for the benefit of the tenant]. In this instance, having gathered, in regard to houses, &c., the fact established on sense-perception, that they exist for the sake of [organized] bodies, for example, something of a different kind therefrom, [i.e., from Nature, viz.], Soul, is inferred [by analogy,] as something other than Nature, &c., [which, as being a compound thing, is not designed for itself]: such is the meaning.[1]

d. But then [some one may say], since Nature is eternal, and exertion is habitual to her, [and the result of her action is the bondage of the Soul], there should constantly be experience [whether of pleasure or of pain], and, hence, no such thing as thorough emancipation. To this he replies:[2]

चिदवसानो भोगः ॥ १०४ ॥

---

[1] पुरुषस्य तु प्रधानं परार्थं संहत्यकारित्वाद्गृहादिवदिति। अत्र प्रत्यक्षसिद्धं देहाद्यर्थकत्वं गृहादिषु गृहीत्वा तद्विजातीयः पुरुषः प्रधानादिपरत्वेनानुमीयत इति ॥

[2] ननु प्रकृतेर्नित्यत्वात्प्रवृत्तिशीलत्वाच्च सर्वदा भोग इत्यनिर्मोक्षः स्यादित्यत आह ॥

When it is that experience ceases.

Aph. 104. Experience [whether of pain or pleasure,] ends with [the discernment of] Thought, [or Soul, as contradistinguished from Nature].

a. By 'Thought' [we mean] Soul. Experience [whether of pain or pleasure,] ceases, on the discerning thereof. As 'antecedent non-existence,' though devoid of a beginning, [see *Tarka-sangraha*, § 92], surceases [when the thing antecedently non-existent begins to be], so, eternal Nature [eternal, as regards the absence of any beginning,] continues [no further than] till the discernment of the difference [between Nature and Soul]; so that experience whether of pain or pleasure,] does *not* at all times occur: such is the state of the case.[1]

b. [But some one say], if Nature be agent, and Soul experiencer, then it must follow [which seems unreasonable,] that another is the experiencer of [the results of] the acts done by one different. To this he replies:[2]

अकर्तुरपि फलोपभोगोऽन्नाद्यवत् ॥ १०५ ॥

The fruit of the action is not always the agent's.

Aph. 105. The experience of the fruit *may* belong even to another than the agent; as in the case of food, &c.

---

[1] चिदात्मा । तद्विवेकावसानो भोगः । यथानादिरपि प्रागभावो नश्यति तथा नित्यायाः प्रकृतेर्विवेकज्ञानपर्यन्तः प्रसर इति न सर्वदा भोगापत्तिरिति भावः ॥

[2] यदि कर्तृ प्रधानं भोक्ता पुरुषस्तर्ह्यन्यकृतस्य कर्मणोऽन्यो भोक्तेति स्यादित्याह ॥

a. As it belongs to the cook to prepare the food, &c., and to one who was not the agent, viz., the master, to enjoy the fruit [thereof, i.e., the fruit of the cook's actions], so is the case here, also.[1]

b. Having stated an exoteric principle [which may serve, in practice, to silence, by the *argumentum ad hominem*, him on whose principles it may be valid], he [next] declares his own doctrine,[2] [in regard to the doubt started under § 104. *b.*]:

अविवेकाद्वा तत्सिद्धेः कर्तुः फलावगमः ॥ १०६ ॥

To suppose that Soul acts and experiences is an error.

Aph. 106. Or, [to give a better account of the matter than that given in § 105], since it is from non-discrimination that it is derived, the notion that the *agent* [soul being mistaken for an agent,] has the fruit [of the act is a wrong notion].

a. The soul is neither an agent nor a patient; but, from the fact that the Great Principle [the actual agent (see § 97. *b.*)] is reflected in it, there arises the *conceit* of its being an agent. 'Or, since it is from non-discrimination;' that is to say, because it is from the failure to discriminate between Nature and Soul, that this takes place, i.e., that conceit takes place, that it is the *agent* that experiences the fruit;[3] [whereas the actual agent is Nature, which, being unintelligent, can experience neither pain nor pleasure].

---

[1] यथा सूपकारस्यान्नादिकर्तृत्वमकर्तुरीश्वरस्य फलोपभोक्तृत्वं तथात्रापीति ॥

[2] व्यवहारसिद्धान्तमुक्त्वा स्वसिद्धान्तमाह ॥

[3] न पुरुषः कर्ता न वा भोक्ता किं तु महत्तत्त्वप्र-